



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2001

No. 97

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Solomon Schiff, Director, Greater Miami Jewish Federation, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Creator, we ask for Thy blessings upon the Members of this sanctified chamber who have accepted the sacred responsibility to serve with partiality to none and compassion to all. May their deliberations be guided by wisdom, purpose, and dedication.

Bless, we pray, our Nation. Thou has created this land as a haven of hope for the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free. From the raw elements of justice, liberty, and equality, Thou has created here Heaven on Earth. May we ever remain worthy of this precious gift.

May this Nation serve as an inspiring beacon, whose light will dispel the darkness of despair and will guide the ship of mankind safely home to the port of peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used on July 26, 2001, for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers.

WELCOMING RABBI SOLOMON SCHIFF, DIRECTOR, GREATER MIAMI JEWISH FEDERATION, MIAMI, FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so very pleased to introduce my congressional constituent, Rabbi Solomon Schiff, of the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, who led us in our opening prayer today.

I am proud to have a spiritual leader from Miami chosen for this special opportunity, and I thank Rabbi Schiff for sharing his compassionate prayer of hope and peace with our colleagues.

Within the south Florida community, Rabbi Schiff is well-known for his

many acts of kindness and charity. In addition to his many duties, he finds time to serve as a member of the Governor's Commission on Aging with Dignity, as well as the People United to Lead the Struggle for Equality, an African American clergy group.

Rabbi Schiff is currently the executive vice president of the Rabbinical Association of Greater Miami, a position he has held since 1964. He is the longest-serving executive of any board of rabbis.

Additionally, he has served as the President of the Florida Chaplains Association and the South Florida Chaplains Association, and was recently elected as President of the National Association of Jewish Chaplains.

Rabbi Schiff is married to the former Shirley Miller, and they have three sons, Elliott, Jeffrey and Steven, as well as seven grandchildren.

Rabbi Schiff is an exemplary man of faith, and all of us in south Florida share tremendous pride that he is here with us today.

Welcome, Solomon Schiff, the rabbi of our community.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair will entertain 10 one-minute speeches per side.

### SUPPORT ENERGY SECURITY ACT TO MEET ENERGY NEEDS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, due to recent current events, I do not think anyone can deny nor can anyone argue that this country needs more energy. Every estimate I have seen points to a sharp rise in our Nation's energy demands over the next 20 years. The demand for electricity, for example, is

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3963

expected to rise 45 percent, according to the DOE, and the demand for natural gas will be even greater. It is expected to rise 62 percent by the year 2020.

Now, everyone knows that conservation can take the edge off that demand, and, in fact, the Republican energy package offers a framework for energy conservation that we have long needed. But, as Californians know quite well, even the best conservation efforts will not solve this problem. They are experiencing about a 15 percent gain in that demand due to conservation. That still leaves us about 40 to 50 percent short, and, without new energy supplies, more businesses, more hospitals, and more homes are going to go dark unnecessarily. We need to produce more energy.

Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2436 the Energy Security Act, which provides a multifaceted energy package.

#### ALLOW UP OR DOWN VOTE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today was the day that we were supposed to debate at long last campaign finance reform. The public understands that if we are to pass campaign finance reform, it will be embodied in the principles of McCain-Feingold or Shays-Meehan. But, unfortunately, the Committee on Rules is recommending a rule that will make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for this body to have an up-or-down vote on the McCain-Feingold/Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform proposal.

That is not right. Those of us who favor reform, unfortunately, will have to oppose this rule so that we can, in fact, have an honest debate and vote up or down campaign finance reform.

#### IMPLEMENT PRESIDENT'S ENERGY PLAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks we have seen gas prices go up and down, and I think we all hope they keep coming down. Energy prices are still too high, supply is not meeting demand, and we are still expecting rolling blackouts in California, and we could still see gas prices as high as \$2 a gallon.

This is the time for leadership. We need real solutions. The President has taken the initiative and is working hard to implement his 105-point plan to increase supply and correct the market, but some politicians just cannot resist the temptation to politicize this for personal gain. They are telling people that there is a quick fix and point-

ing fingers at anyone who says there is not.

But we cannot just put price caps on energy. If anything, that will make the problem worse, by removing any incentive to increase production. We need to remove impediments to production so supply can go up and prices can come down.

The last two economic recessions were preceded by similar energy crunches. Hopefully we can still avert a recession, but only if we stop playing games and implement the President's energy plan.

#### RETURN GOVERNMENT BACK TO THE PEOPLE

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the Committee on Rules of this House is thwarting the will of the Members of this House and of the American people to clean up our campaign finance system in this country.

For all too long we have seen the flow of special interest money into the coffers of politicians on both sides of the aisle, in the House and the Senate and the White House, and we have seen the effect of this flow of money. It is now corroding the very pillars of our democracy. It is undermining the foundations of our deliberations in the House and the Senate and at the White House. It means that the people's business does not get done on a fair and level playing field. It means that there is special access for those who can give huge amounts of money, but there is very little access for those who simply have their voice.

This is not about the first amendment; this is about whether or not this House, this Congress, this Presidency, will return the Government of the United States back to the people and take it away from those who have no end to the amount of money that they can contribute to Members of Congress or the President, those who have so often distorted the debate about the real needs of the American people at this time in our history.

#### INFLUENCE PEDDLING OF SO-CALLED REFORMERS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the words of my friend from California, and I just find it ironic; he hails from a State that once championed the free speech movement at Berkeley, and today on this floor, with a rule that will allow to come to the floor amendments that doctor the so-called campaign reform bill, we will have a chance to see just how corrupting a process can be.

Talk about dirty money, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at the influence-peddling of the so-called reformers.

The simplest way to handle this would be to heed the words of Mr. Justice Brandeis who said that sunlight is the best disinfectant. Yes, it is going to be very enlightening, and I find it fascinating that my friends on the left suddenly now find it unfair to completely debate this important issue. Curiouser and curiously, said Alice. Today the American people will find out just how corrupt and curious the process has become.

#### SUCKER FISH DESTROYING LIVELIHOOD OF OREGON FARMERS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the endangered sucker fish is living up to its reputation, sucking the livelihood from 1,400 farmers in Oregon. That is right. This protected bottom feeder now has more rights than farmers out there. If that is not enough to fry your mackerel, this region has now been without irrigated water since April, turning 200,000 acres of farmland into near desert.

Beam me up. Stop this sucker fish crusade. Free these farmers.

I yield back the fact that this sucker fish sucks.

#### THE PROMISE OF STEM CELLS

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the NIH guidelines for stem cell research. We must look to the promise of stem cell research. The NIH guidelines will enable scientists to proceed with this revolutionary medical breakthrough.

Pluripotent stem cells have the ability to develop into nearly any cell in the human body. This research initiative gives hopes to millions of Americans. Stem cells offer hope to patients suffering from diabetes, Parkinson's disease, cancer and AIDS.

□ 1015

In addition, the research offers hope to those suffering from spinal cord injuries, neurological disorders, sickle cell anemia and muscular dystrophy. Stem cells could also help determine the cause of many birth defects.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are depending on stem cell research to help rid them of painful diseases. Millions of Americans continue to wait as our Government delays in considering this critical form of research. We have a genuine bipartisan opportunity to apply innovative research to take real steps in treating and eliminating a wide range of diseases. The NIH guidelines will help us do that.

### MOMENT OF TRUTH FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a very proud cosponsor of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act. It was one of the first bills that I cosponsored in this House because it puts people first.

Earlier this week, I had the privilege of standing with our colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), at the birthplace of one of America's truly great reformers, President Teddy Roosevelt. We stood together in a bipartisan call for campaign finance reform, united in an urgency to restore faith in our democracy.

In his day, President Roosevelt said this: "One of the fundamental necessities in a representative government such as ours is to make certain that the men to whom they delegate their power shall serve the people by whom they are elected and not the special interests."

Mr. Speaker, today is literally the moment of truth in this House on campaign finance reform. We can keep our promises for reform, or we can pretend to keep our promises. The only true reform is known by McCain-Feingold and Shays-Meehan. Let us pass that today.

### OPPOSE THE RESTRICTIONS ON FREE SPEECH IN SHAYS-MEEHAN MEASURE

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, this body is on the verge of a very important vote today, a vote that at its essence is really a vote on whether or not to uphold the constitutional right Americans have to free speech.

The restrictions in the Shays-Meehan bill are an affront to the Jeffersonian values of individual liberty and freedom that form the foundation of our country and its rule of law. Individuals, organizations, and businesses in our great land should be able to support the viewpoint and the party of their choice. If we place burdensome restrictions on how citizens are allowed to participate in our electoral process, we begin to undermine the basis of our Government by the people, a government to which citizens must be able to contribute freely.

As we cast our vote today on campaign finance reform, I urge my colleagues to remember the most essential reform is to ensure that everyone in America has the right to decide how to contribute to our system of democracy.

### SUPPORT REAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of real campaign finance reform.

Why is this so critical? Why is it so important to us today? There is far too much special interest money in our political democracy. Special interests are drowning out the voice of the American people, and they are sick of it.

In my race in San Diego, my opponent and I were outspent by special interests by a ratio of 4 to 1. Special interests' television and mailers flooded the 49th district constituents. All of this soft money made it virtually impossible for the candidates to communicate directly to the voters. Voters were frustrated with a lack of honest information. There was so much information coming from so many undisclosed sources that they did not know whom to believe and what was coming from whom.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that voters are the center of our democratic election system. They deserve nothing less. So I urge this House to pass strong and effective campaign finance reform today, to do it without games, and to do it in an honest and straightforward way. The American public is depending upon us.

### MINNESOTANS WANT REAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Minnesotans want real campaign finance reform. They want it now. My State has led the Nation in how we run our elections. From our voters registering on election day to limiting our campaign spending, Minnesota campaigns have a reputation of being open, honest and competitive; and we consistently lead the Nation in voter turnout.

One of the reasons why I ran for Congress was to work to help to restore the public's trust in our elected leaders. The Shays-Meehan bill is the first good step in cleaning up our campaign finance system. By eliminating soft money, Americans' confidence in our electoral system will be restored.

Mr. Speaker, this bill helps to control the amount of money contributed in campaigns, but we need to go farther. We must take control of how much money is spent on elections. I will work to take the next step on campaign finance reform by limiting the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on our elections. However, we must begin now. We must begin today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Shays-Meehan and begin the process.

### DEFEAT CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today we have a very important issue before us: campaign finance reform. I want to talk about two amendments that are going to be coming up before us.

One is known as the Linder-Schrock amendment, and it bans the use of funds that unions and corporations would give to communicate with their members and stockholders. How ridiculous.

In California we had a similar proposition, and it failed miserably; and that proposition was known as Prop 226. I am glad to say that the residents and those that voted in that election defeated that overwhelmingly. Let us make sure that we defeat that amendment here also.

Another amendment that I believe is egregious would also restrict and limit legal immigrants from making contributions to Federal candidates. Again, we are limiting their ability to voice their opinions. This is known as the Bereuter-Wicker amendment, which would preclude individuals from communicating with people and ideals that they support.

If this is truly America, then we have to stand up for all legal immigrants that are tax-paying, that serve our country, that are playing by the rules, and that are maybe one step away of becoming citizens. Let us do the right thing and defeat these two amendments.

### OPPOSE THE RULE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious, we are all anxious, to begin campaign finance reform and to begin it by making our rules more fair. Unfortunately, we need to oppose the rule that is coming before this House this morning. It is a rule that tells the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) that they cannot present their bill to this House in the form that they want to present it. Instead, the manager's amendment is chopped up into 12 pieces.

This is unprecedented. This is unfair. This is not reform. This is not the way this House should conduct its business. A vote on Shays-Meehan should be a vote on the bill that the authors would like us to vote on, not an old draft from 3 or 4 weeks ago. If we have a manager's amendment that comes before this House, it should be one amendment, not chopped up into 12 time-wasting pieces.

Vote "no" on the rule.

# TIME TO END CORRUPTING INFLUENCE OF MONEY ON PUBLIC POLICY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the corrupting influence of money on public policy is evident in this House every day. It is evident not only as a principal concern that arises here on vote after vote, significantly influenced by who, gave how much, to whom, when, but it is also particularly evident in the silence on critical issues of public policy, on what is never discussed. When we are unable to consider critical issues of public health because of the soft money contributions from Philip Morris and the tobacco industry; when we are never able to debate the outrageous price discrimination against our seniors on their pharmaceuticals because of the millions of dollars that the pharmaceutical companies contribute, and by the multiple issues never considered that impact our children, who make no campaign contribution.

Today we have an opportunity to consider a very modest, a very incomplete and imperfect answer to this troubling predicament through bipartisan legislation. This legislation represents our best hope to begin to correct this outrage and restore our democracy to the people.

## PASS MEANINGFUL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to pass meaningful campaign finance reform. What it will do, what the bipartisan Shays-Meehan Campaign Reform Act will do is to take the soft money out of politics, take the special interest money out of politics. It will help us to restore the integrity to our political system. It will help us today to restore the confidence that the American public needs to have in people who serve in public life, restore their confidence in our government that, in fact, we can act on behalf of the interests of the people that we represent and not the interests of the moneyed interests in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation here to pass meaningful campaign finance reform so that, in fact, we can get about the business of making sure that we have a Patients' Bill of Rights, which is a bipartisan piece of legislation; that we have a prescription drug benefit so that we can bring some relief to people who are struggling with the high cost of drugs in this country; that we can have a clean and a safe environment.

That is what this bill is about. It is a bipartisan bill. It is authored by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN). This bill has passed twice in this House before, and we should take today that opportunity to make it a law.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 50, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

### YEAS—362

Ackerman  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot

Chambliss  
Clay  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes

Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel

Issa  
Istook  
Jackson  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Jones (TX)  
Kantor  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Largent  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton

### NAYS—50

Aderholt  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Becerra  
Bonior  
Borski  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Capuano  
Costello  
Crane  
Crowley  
DeFazio  
English  
Filner  
Gephardt  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefley  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kucinich  
Larsen (WA)  
Lewis (GA)  
LoBiondo  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Moran (KS)  
Oberstar  
Peterson (MN)  
Ramstad  
Sabo  
Schaffer  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sweeney  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Udall (NM)  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Wamp  
Waters  
Weller  
Wu

### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

### NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie  
Clayton  
Cox  
Culberson  
Fattah  
Hutchinson  
Lantos  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
McKinney  
Murtha  
Paul  
Platts  
Rangel

Shaw  
Smith (NJ)

Spence  
Thomas

Watkins (OK)  
Young (AK)

□ 1049

Mr. THOMPSON of California changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 7, noes 412, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

## AYES—7

Bentsen  
Carson (IN)  
Filner

Hastings (FL)  
McNulty  
Smith (NJ)

Towns

## NOES—412

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Billirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps

Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English

Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda

Hooley  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loftgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
Meehan

Bass  
Cox  
Fattah  
Gephardt  
Hall (OH)

Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer

## NOT VOTING—14

Hilliard  
Horn  
Hutchinson  
Lewis (CA)  
Paul

Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Young (FL)

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2216, 2001 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves that the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to go to conference is basically a routine motion. We need to get to conference on this supplemental. We have military operations, training activities, we have readiness issues ready to close down if we do not provide the additional money that is needed. Much of the money that has been used already from the fourth quarter accounts of the military have gone to pay for things like higher fuel costs, like all of us will have to do at the fueling pumps, to pay for medical expenses that have already been incurred by members of the military, their families and retirees, that have already been incurred but have not been paid. They need to be paid.

There are other items included in this conference, and time is extremely important. I suggest that we should get on with moving this bill into the conference so that we can actually sit down with our counterparts in the other body, have the conference, and have a supplemental bill ready to report back to the House early next week.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to yield to this side of the aisle any time?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to until the gentleman asked. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman. Would he like to name a specific amount of time?

□ 1110

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it depends on how much time the gentleman intends to take. Normally it is an hour, but it can be less than that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, actually I am ready to vote, but I would yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could we make it 20 minutes on this side?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I would advise him that I do not intend to use much more time on this. The issue is so important that we need to get to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 20 minutes to control of debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are caught up in two issues here this morning. One is, of course, the issue before us, the question of the proper disposition of the motion to go to conference on the supplemental appropriations. But we are also, in debating that issue, caught up in the larger question this morning of what is going to happen for the rest of this day as we move into the subject that will dominate debate for the rest of the day, campaign finance legislation.

□ 1115

It had been the reasonable expectation of reformers on both sides of the aisle, I believe, that the two competing propositions would be allowed to face each other in a stand-up, fair fight, Shays-Meehan on one side of the issue and the Ney-Wynn proposition on the other side of the issue. Instead, the Committee on Rules has not allowed that to happen. What they have done is report a rule which will require campaign finance legislation to be debated under very strange circumstances. It will not allow Shays-Meehan to present their package as a coherent whole. It requires some 12 amendments to be voted on separately. I would say that that is sort of like telling people to go into a car dealer if they want to buy a car and telling them they have to buy one that is disassembled; they will have to buy a transmission separately; they will have to buy the tires separately; they will have to buy the motor separately.

That is not the way you buy cars, and that is not the way we ought to legislate. We ought to have a fair fight between the two principal propositions that we will be asked to choose between today. But instead we are not going to be given a fair fight, because apparently the people who designed these rules think the only way they can win the debate is to stack the deck. I think that is unfortunate because I think we have evidence on both sides of the aisle that there are Members who want true reform and are willing to vote for it.

I would simply say that I have substantial doubts about the wisdom of either of the propositions that will be brought before us. But if the House leadership will go through these kind of machinations and this kind of manipulation and these kind of contortions in order to block the incredibly tepid reform represented by Shays-Meehan, I would hate to see what they would do to block comprehensive reform of campaign finance legislation.

Let me also say a bit about the motion before us. I do not, when the time comes, expect to vote against the motion to go to conference; but I will ask for a rollcall vote on it. I want to express some concerns about what we ought to do on that proposition.

We are being asked to go to conference on a bill which everyone understands is totally inadequate even by administration standards. The administration has told us in the words of the FEMA director, Mr. Albaugh, and also in the words of Mr. Daniels, the OMB director as quoted in the *Houston Chronicle*, that they will probably need considerably more money than is presently appropriated for FEMA. Yet the House bill for the supplemental actually rescinds existing appropriations for FEMA. That makes no sense whatsoever.

Secondly, the administration is planning to spend \$30 million on a political mailing to tell people that they are going to get a tax cut check, and they already know they are going to get a tax cut check. Meanwhile, the Congress is refusing to appropriate the money necessary to the victims of radiation poisoning, a claim which has already been clearly established and an entitlement which has already been clearly established. So they are willing to spend money on this political mailing, but they are not willing to deliver these payments to people who are sick and dying who have been literally fried by their own government. I do not think that makes much sense.

Thirdly, even though the administration has asked us to provide funding to protect public health and to protect the health of our farm stock from the twin problems of mad cow disease and foot and mouth disease, this Congress has chosen not to appropriate funds requested by the administration for those items. When the proper time comes, I will have a motion instructing conferees to accept those three changes in the House bill. But for now I want to make clear that this additional step this morning has been required because of the anger that is felt I think on the part of people on both sides of the aisle about the stacked deck that has been provided to us in the rule on campaign finance.

This House ought to be able to debate these two issues straight up and not be hampered by indirection and manipulation. The name of the game is clear. It is the hope of the people who designed this rule on campaign finance that they can pick off one or more of those

12 separate fix-up amendments to Shays-Meehan and in the process prevent people from voting on the entire comprehensive, coherent package. That is indeed unfortunate. I think it is an abuse of the process, but it is not the first time we have seen that around here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened with interest to the gentleman's discussion. I checked my schedule, the card that I carry to tell me where I am supposed to be all day long. I thought we were here talking about a supplemental appropriations bill for national defense and for other health issues and other emergency disaster issues. I did not realize that this motion had anything at all to do with campaign finance reform. That is because it does not. Absolutely nothing. And then I thought, are we on a tax bill? No, we are not on a tax bill. This has nothing to do with a tax bill. So I am not sure where we are going with this debate.

I mentioned in my opening comments about the needs of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. Let me tell Members what else is in this supplemental bill, that has nothing to do with campaign finance reform or with the tax refund except for the money to mail out the refund checks.

This legislation will address emergency needs related to natural disasters, a number of which have occurred; including recent floods, ice storms, in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas; the Seattle earthquake; and approximately 300 wildland fires that we have had to deal with. These needs are also covered in this supplemental appropriations bill. Assistance is important to all of the communities that suffered these terrible disasters.

Additional energy needs are met for the poorest of the poor, those who need help with their energy assistance. LIHEAP, a program that everybody in this Chamber knows about, is provided \$300 million in this bill. I think that is a program that the gentleman from Wisconsin supports enthusiastically. We did increase it over the President's request to the \$300 million mark. Also in this bill is \$160 million to implement last year's conference agreement on Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged. There is \$115 million to enable the Department of Treasury to mail out the tax rebate checks. If people have tax rebate checks coming to them, we ought to mail them out.

Mr. Speaker, the discussion today is about sending this bill to conference. We need to get this bill to conference so we can work out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. They are not that great, actually. We will be able to bring this conference back to the House, I believe, early next week if we can get to conference today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate one thing that the gentleman from Florida spoke about. There is a problem called "hold harmless" in title I education funds, to where the States that are losing population maintain a certain level, but those States that are gaining children that are impoverished do not get additional dollars. I worked with a Senator in the other body from California, we brought it to conference; and we decided to fund both until we can find resolution to that. Guess what? There was not enough money to do that. So those children that are the poorest of the poor in title I funds, this supplemental takes care of it. That is one of the reasons this is important.

Secondly, we met with Secretary Rumsfeld this morning. While all the 12 appropriations bills have been going up, if you have got a baseline, up to a level like this, Defense with all of the deployments we have had, the cost is down here in the cellar. Even this supplemental will only bring us up to a level here. It will not even bring us back up to the baseline.

Secretary Rumsfeld said that one of the most important things that will happen if we do not get this besides all of the ships and things and the repairs and the training that stops, our TDY personnel, that is temporary duty orders, and our permanent moves, right now it is the summertime when our military folks' kids are out of session and they are trying to get their families moved in to their next base so that they can enroll their children into the schools. If we do not hurry up and do this, that is going to be delayed; and all of those families, the disruption of not having your child entered into a school is going to be affected. So we strongly support this amount in this supplemental. It is critical. We should have done it before we left for our Fourth of July break, and now it is even more critical.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Florida has indicated what is in this bill. There is no argument about what is in this bill. I intend to vote to go to conference. The problem is what is not in this bill. It does not contain the roughly \$1 billion that we have been given indications from the administration itself that in the end we will need to meet our obligations in dealing with the disasters cited by the gentleman from Florida, including the huge disaster in Houston and several in other States, including my own. It does not contain the money requested by the administration to protect this country from foot and mouth disease and from mad cow disease. And it does not contain the money that is needed to pay the victims of radiation poisoning who are entitled to that money. We will have a motion to instruct asking that those three items be included.

With respect to the other point made by the gentleman, I fully grant that this issue does not involve campaign finance. But when what I believe to be a majority of this House, composed of people on both sides of the aisle, when that House majority has been denied the opportunity by the Committee on Rules that runs this House, when they have been denied the opportunity to vote on the package that they believe ought to pass for campaign finance reform, except in piecemeal fashion, then there are only so many tools available for that majority to protest what is going on. That is why we are having this additional debate this morning. I regret the fact that it takes the time, but not nearly as much as I regret what the Committee on Rules did to what I believe is the majority will of this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), who is a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I normally would not rise to get into this debate, but I just got back from visiting our troops in Korea. They need our help. I just got back from Italy from visiting our troops. They need our help. I visited my base at home. They need our help.

I think, with all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I like the gentleman from Wisconsin and we are friends, but I think to use our servicepeople and involve them in a disagreement over a political matter in this House, I cannot stand idly by and not speak that I think that is inappropriate. Our people in the field need to train, they need care, they need help. To allow them to become part of a partisan battle here I think is inappropriate.

□ 1130

We voted on this. We should pass this. We should get this help.

I just came back from the Defense Department. They need a lot more help, because we have underfunded the Defense Department. They admit they have waste, they admit they have problems, and they are trying to change them. I think that we should get on with that and not bring other debates into a situation where our troops and their lives and their training and their families on these PCS changes and everything else is affected. It is not appropriate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out it is the majority in this House that held this supplemental up for 4 months. This debate does not have one whit to do with whether our military personnel will get the help they need or not. They will. They will have virtually unanimous support on both sides of the aisle. To suggest that aid to them will

be delayed by 1 day is absurd, preposterous, nonsense. Everybody on both sides of the aisle is going to be for that aid. What we want to see in addition is other obligations of the government also met to American citizens, including the American citizens who were literally killed by their own government through the use of nuclear testing and other problems associated with conducting nuclear tests. That has nothing whatsoever to do with whether our military personnel will get the funds they need. Of course they will.

I challenge the gentleman to name one person involved in this bill on either side of the aisle who is opposed to that money. He cannot because there are not any.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious where the figure of 4 months comes from, where they held this bill up for 4 months. We passed this bill on the June 20, which was about 2 weeks after we got the request from the White House. The House expedited consideration of this measure, brought it to the floor; and we passed this bill.

The problem has been that the other body did not take it up right away, and they just passed it a few days ago. So I do not know where the gentleman got the idea that we delayed it for 4 months, because we did not delay it at all.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to tell the gentleman. The White House itself announced they were not going to send down the request for the supplemental until after the tax bill was finished because they did not want to upset the apple cart on their tax bill.

The last time I looked, the White House was in Republican hands, as is the majority of this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman was not saying that the House delayed this bill, because the House did not delay this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. No, I am not saying that. I am saying that the administration itself delayed the request for over 2 months until they could get their precious tax gift to rich people out of the Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman if he would answer this question: Will the gentleman agree then that the House actually did expedite the bill once we got the request?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely, no problem with the timing. I have a lot of problems with the timing of the White House on this one.



Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for that response.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what this argument is about today, because everybody knows we have to go to conference on this bill. Now when we bring the conference report back or during the conference itself, there will be some negotiations and there will be some discussions. There may be some things added and some things taken away, but the truth of the matter is, we sent this bill to the Senate at \$6.5 billion, which was the amount that was agreed upon by the House and the Senate. The Senate leadership said that they would not go above \$6.5 billion. Their bill is a little different than ours, but that is also not unusual. That is why we go to conference, to work out those differences.

So I am not sure what this argument is all about. In the beginning, it sounded like it was about campaign finance reform, but I do not think that is the case. We need to get this bill into conference, Mr. Speaker, so I am going to ask for a very strong yeas vote so that we can continue the process.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental but in opposition to the rule for the Shays-Meehan bill. What we needed was a fair fight, an up or down vote on Shays-Meehan, a quality, balanced, bipartisan campaign finance bill that a majority of this House has supported twice and that has already passed the Senate.

We needed a fair rule. But what did we get? We got a mine field. We got Shays-Meehan shattered, fragmented, broken into 14 separate parts that needs to be reassembled in separate votes into that fragile flower called consensus. After the mine field, more poison pill votes. Apparently the leadership felt they could not win on the merits so they had to manipulate the process to shortchange the American people once again. Campaign finance reform is the litmus test for real change in this Congress. And the real litmus test for supporters of campaign finance reform is voting against this destructive, unfair, undemocratic rule.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to go to conference, and also support of the later motion to instruct conferees to oppose rescission of funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, the disaster relief fund. The Senate restored the \$389

million that was cut in our original supplemental that passed here, but estimates now say that FEMA may need as much as a billion dollars between now and October 1. The need for money in this fund is real and it is pressing and we should not be reducing or cutting any funding from FEMA.

Already this year there will be 27 major disaster declarations across our country, including the devastating funds in my hometown of Houston and across southern Texas, southeastern Texas, Louisiana, and even up into Philadelphia from Tropical Storm Allison. The damage estimates from this declaration alone are estimated to be \$5 billion. Traditionally, FEMA pays about half of this amount in damage assistance so we are talking about \$2.5 billion.

Since FEMA's disaster budget is only \$1.6 billion total, we need to make sure that funding is increased and not decreased. There is still a lot of time left in this fiscal year, and I would expect we have not seen the last of the disaster declarations and thus need more funding for disaster relief.

To date, FEMA has had 85,000 disaster relief applications in the Houston area from Tropical Storm Allison. Of the 70,000 homes that FEMA inspected, 67,000 of those inspections are completed and 3,500 were completely destroyed. Over 10,000 suffered major damage and 33,000, almost 34,000, have minor damage, totaling 47,999 affected properties.

Of the more than \$500 million initially allocated for this disaster by FEMA, \$434 million, or 84 percent of these funds, have already been committed; and we are not even 2 months after the disaster. That is, they either have been or will be sent out to those in need of assistance.

That \$434 million is already more than the \$389 million that we cut in the last supplemental that passed this House. Remember, this is just one disaster with \$5 billion in damages. Twenty-six other parts of our country have suffered disasters of varying degrees. That is why I would hope the House would agree with the Senate and restore the \$389 million as the first step, and we need to make sure that we provide FEMA the money not just for my own constituents but also for all the people in our country who have experienced disasters.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will offer shortly. As my colleague, the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. GREEN) just spoke of Tropical Storm Allison, the damage that

has been done is unbelievable. Last week, my colleagues the gentlemen from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and (Mr. BRADY) and I were joined by Secretary of Health and Human Services Thompson when we toured the Texas Medical Center, which is in the 25th district that I represent. This is the largest medical center in world.

As a result of Tropical Storm Allison, it is estimated the damage to that medical center alone will exceed \$2 billion. The three main hospitals are shut down. The City of Houston and Harris County, the fourth largest city, the third largest county in the United States, is now operating with one level-one trauma center because the other level-one trauma center, Herman Hospital, has been shut down and will be shut down for several months.

The two main medical schools, Baylor College of Medicine and the University of Texas Health Science Center are shut down as a result of this storm. This is an area that trains a large portion of our doctors, including one of the largest percentages of pediatricians are trained through the Texas Medical Center, and a large portion of that is shut down. As my colleague mentioned, the Harris County Tax Collector Assessor estimates the damage close to \$5 billion and FEMA now estimates their obligation to date to be about \$2.4 billion, of which they paid out already about \$400 million.

That being said, FEMA only has approximately \$800 million in direct and contingency appropriations on hand in order to cover this storm, not to mention the affects of Allison in Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi; not to mention the storms that just occurred in West Virginia; not to mention other storms that have occurred; not to mention the other storms that will occur for the remainder of the fiscal year.

As my colleague mentioned, 85,000 people in the 30 counties that were affected in Texas have filed claims with FEMA. 60,000-plus homes have been inspected. 3,500 homes are already deemed to have been destroyed beyond repair and that number will certainly go up.

The fact is that the money that FEMA currently has in their disaster accounts now is insufficient, and to take \$389 million out would be a grave mistake.

The other body has seen the wisdom of this and they have restored the money; and, in fact, they added a million dollars as a place holder to look at adding to this.

The director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Daniels, told our committee, the Committee on the Budget, the other day, he told the Senate Committee on the Budget subsequently, that they believed that FEMA will need additional money in the current fiscal year.

Now as I said, in the past, when we debated this, when the committee on the House side chose to rescind the \$389 million, Tropical Storm Allison had



not yet occurred, and had the committee marked up the bill a week later after Tropical Storm Allison, I strongly believe that they would not have chosen to rescind it because they could not have foreseen the disaster that was going to occur.

This was a 500-year event, meaning that it has a half of a percent of a chance of happening in any given year, but it did occur.

So I would hope that the House will adopt the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to instruct, that the House, when it goes to conference with the Senate on this otherwise very important bill, will recede to the Senate's position, restore the \$389 million; and I would hope, even more to the point, that the House and the Senate conference will go further and add the billion dollars that is estimated because it is going to be far greater than that. But we know we will have other disasters, and we will have to respond because it is an essential function of the government. And Congress should not be standing in the way of that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, when the vote comes, I will join my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and ask the people to vote yes on the motion. I will also ask them to vote yes on a later motion that we will make to add three items to this proposition. We will simply be asking the House to approve three Senate actions that would eliminate the rescission for FEMA, that would fund the administration request for mad cow disease and for hoof and mouth disease, and to fund the claims for radiation victims, many of whom are sick or dying and some of whom have already died.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am happy to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) say that he will vote for this motion. I hope that everybody will vote for this motion so we can get to the business of the conference.

I would point out that the gentleman from Wisconsin will be an important member of that conference committee and will have every opportunity to make whatever suggestions that he has; and I am satisfied that he would be very influential in that conference committee, as he always is. But we need to vote. I do not know if the gentleman is going to ask for a rollcall vote or not, but we need to get on with the conference. I would like to get the conference work done before the House adjourns for the weekend.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks on H.R. 2216, as well as on any motion to go to conference on H.R. 2216, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 3, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—423

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Capuano       | Etheridge     |
| Ackerman    | Cardin        | Evans         |
| Aderholt    | Carson (IN)   | Everett       |
| Akin        | Carson (OK)   | Farr          |
| Allen       | Castle        | Fattah        |
| Andrews     | Chabot        | Ferguson      |
| Armey       | Chambliss     | Flake         |
| Baca        | Clay          | Fletcher      |
| Bachus      | Clayton       | Forbes        |
| Baird       | Clement       | Ford          |
| Baker       | Clyburn       | Fossella      |
| Baldacci    | Coble         | Frank         |
| Baldwin     | Collins       | Frelinghuysen |
| Ballenger   | Combest       | Frost         |
| Barcia      | Condit        | Galleghy      |
| Barr        | Conyers       | Ganske        |
| Barrett     | Cooksey       | Gekas         |
| Bartlett    | Costello      | Gephardt      |
| Barton      | Cox           | Gibbons       |
| Bass        | Coyne         | Gilchrest     |
| Becerra     | Cramer        | Gillmor       |
| Bentsen     | Crane         | Gilman        |
| Bereuter    | Crenshaw      | Gonzalez      |
| Berkley     | Berkley       | Crowley       |
| Berman      | Cubin         | Goodlatte     |
| Berry       | Culberson     | Gordon        |
| Biggert     | Cummings      | Goss          |
| Blirakis    | Cunningham    | Graham        |
| Bishop      | Davis (CA)    | Granger       |
| Blagojevich | Davis (FL)    | Graves        |
| Blumenauer  | Davis (IL)    | Green (TX)    |
| Blunt       | Davis, Jo Ann | Green (WI)    |
| Boehlert    | Davis, Tom    | Greenwood     |
| Boehner     | Deal          | Grucchi       |
| Bonilla     | DeGette       | Gutierrez     |
| Bonior      | Delahunt      | Gutknecht     |
| Bono        | DeLauro       | Hall (OH)     |
| Borski      | DeLay         | Hall (TX)     |
| Boswell     | DeMint        | Hansen        |
| Boucher     | Deutsch       | Harman        |
| Boyd        | Diaz-Balart   | Hart          |
| Brady (PA)  | Dicks         | Hastings (FL) |
| Brady (TX)  | Dingell       | Hastings (WA) |
| Brown (FL)  | Doggett       | Hayes         |
| Brown (OH)  | Dooley        | Hayworth      |
| Brown (SC)  | Doolittle     | Hefley        |
| Bryant      | Doyle         | Heger         |
| Burr        | Dreier        | Hill          |
| Burton      | Duncan        | Hilleary      |
| Buyer       | Dunn          | Hilliard      |
| Callahan    | Edwards       | Hinchey       |
| Calvert     | Ehlers        | Hinojosa      |
| Camp        | Ehrlich       | Hobson        |
| Cannon      | Emerson       | Hoefel        |
| Cantor      | Engel         | Hoekstra      |
| Capito      | English       | Holden        |
| Capps       | Eshoo         | Holt          |

|                |                |               |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Honda          | Meehan         | Schakowsky    |
| Hooley         | Meek (FL)      | Schiff        |
| Horn           | Meeks (NY)     | Schrock       |
| Hostettler     | Menendez       | Scott         |
| Houghton       | Mica           | Sensenbrenner |
| Hoyer          | Millender-     | Serrano       |
| Hulshof        | McDonald       | Sessions      |
| Hunter         | Miller (FL)    | Shadegg       |
| Hutchinson     | Miller, Gary   | Shaw          |
| Hyde           | Miller, George | Shays         |
| Inslee         | Mink           | Sherman       |
| Isakson        | Mollohan       | Sherwood      |
| Israel         | Moore          | Shimkus       |
| Issa           | Moran (KS)     | Shows         |
| Istook         | Moran (VA)     | Shuster       |
| Jackson (IL)   | Murtha         | Simmons       |
| Jackson-Lee    | Myrick         | Simpson       |
| (TX)           | Nadler         | Skeen         |
| Jenkins        | Napolitano     | Skelton       |
| John           | Neal           | Slaughter     |
| Johnson (CT)   | Nethercutt     | Smith (MI)    |
| Johnson (IL)   | Ney            | Smith (NJ)    |
| Johnson, E. B. | Northup        | Smith (TX)    |
| Johnson, Sam   | Norwood        | Smith (WA)    |
| Jones (NC)     | Nussle         | Snyder        |
| Jones (OH)     | Oberstar       | Solis         |
| Kanjorski      | Obey           | Souder        |
| Kaptur         | Olver          | Spratt        |
| Keller         | Ortiz          | Stark         |
| Kelly          | Osborne        | Stearns       |
| Kennedy (MN)   | Ose            | Stenholm      |
| Kennedy (RI)   | Otter          | Strickland    |
| Kerns          | Owens          | Stump         |
| Kildee         | Oxley          | Stupak        |
| Kilpatrick     | Pallone        | Sununu        |
| Kind (WI)      | Pascarell      | Sweeney       |
| King (NY)      | Pastor         | Tancredo      |
| Kingston       | Payne          | Tanner        |
| Kirk           | Pelosi         | Tauscher      |
| Klecza         | Pence          | Tauzin        |
| Knollenberg    | Peterson (MN)  | Taylor (MS)   |
| Kolbe          | Peterson (PA)  | Taylor (NC)   |
| Kucinich       | Petri          | Terry         |
| LaFalce        | Phelps         | Thomas        |
| LaHood         | Pickering      | Thompson (CA) |
| Lampson        | Pitts          | Thompson (MS) |
| Langevin       | Platts         | Thornberry    |
| Lantos         | Pombo          | Thune         |
| Largent        | Pomeroy        | Thurman       |
| Larsen (WA)    | Portman        | Tiahrt        |
| Larson (CT)    | Price (NC)     | Tiberi        |
| Latham         | Pryce (OH)     | Tierney       |
| LaTourette     | Putnam         | Toomey        |
| Leach          | Quinn          | Towns         |
| Lee            | Radanovich     | Traficant     |
| Levin          | Rahall         | Turner        |
| Lewis (GA)     | Ramstad        | Udall (CO)    |
| Lewis (KY)     | Rangel         | Udall (NM)    |
| Linder         | Regula         | Upton         |
| Lipinski       | Rehberg        | Velazquez     |
| LoBiondo       | Reyes          | Visclosky     |
| Lofgren        | Reynolds       | Vitter        |
| Lowey          | Riley          | Walden        |
| Lucas (KY)     | Rivers         | Walsh         |
| Lucas (OK)     | Rodriguez      | Wamp          |
| Luther         | Roemer         | Waters        |
| Maloney (CT)   | Rogers (KY)    | Watkins (OK)  |
| Maloney (NY)   | Rogers (MI)    | Watson (CA)   |
| Manzullo       | Rohrabacher    | Watt (NC)     |
| Markey         | Ros-Lehtinen   | Watts (OK)    |
| Mascara        | Ross           | Waxman        |
| Matheson       | Rothman        | Weiner        |
| Matsui         | Roukema        | Weldon (FL)   |
| McCarthy (MO)  | Roybal-Allard  | Weldon (PA)   |
| McCarthy (NY)  | Royce          | Weller        |
| McCollum       | Rush           | Wexler        |
| McCrery        | Ryan (WI)      | Whitfield     |
| McDermott      | Ryun (KS)      | Wicker        |
| McGovern       | Sabo           | Wilson        |
| McHugh         | Sanchez        | Wolf          |
| McInnis        | Sanders        | Woolsey       |
| McIntyre       | Sandin         | Wynn          |
| McKeon         | Sawyer         | Young (AK)    |
| McKinney       | Saxton         | Young (FL)    |
| McNulty        | Schaffer       |               |

NAYS—3

|            |             |        |
|------------|-------------|--------|
| DeFazio    | Filner      | Wu     |
|            |             |        |
| Foley      | Morella     | Spence |
| Jefferson  | Paul        |        |
| Lewis (CA) | Scarborough |        |

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1208

Mr. STARK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2216 be instructed:

(1) to insist that no provision to rescind funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Disaster Relief Fund be included in the conference report on H.R. 2216;

(2) to agree to the provision contained in the Senate amendment that appropriates an additional \$35,000,000 for "DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; and

(3) to agree to the provision contained in the Senate amendment that appropriates an additional \$84,000,000 for "Payment to Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund" for claims covered by the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think more than a few Members of this House and a lot of people outside of this institution have been pleasantly surprised at the relative unity this House has had on a bipartisan basis on appropriation bills this year.

Last night we passed the agriculture appropriations bill with 95 percent support in this House. We had similar majorities which supported the transportation bill, the energy and water bill, the interior bill. And it seems to me that that kind of consensus we have been able to develop on each of those bills has been good for both parties, it has been good for the House, it has been good for the country. It helps us to get our work done, and it helps us to build a foundation for cooperation on other items. I think it has been a very positive thing and something we have not seen enough of in this House in recent years.

However, the legislation which the majority is asking us to pass today in this bill does not represent that type of consensus. It is not bipartisan legislation. It has been handed down from on high. I think it is severely constrained by a narrow, partisan, ideological judgment about how we spend our money

and how we meet the country's needs, and I think the current situation illustrates clearly how misguided that judgment is.

There are a few people on the other side of the aisle and people in the White House who have taken the position that once Congress has passed a budget plan, we have to put together our bills through the year, and that we cannot address any other needs beyond those anticipated in the original plan. It does not matter how much circumstances change; it apparently does not matter what the magnitude of natural disasters are that strike; it does not matter, I suppose, if we decide to go to war. If we have only a few months left in the fiscal year and a hurricane strikes, we can wait until October 1 to provide assistance, or we can fire IRS agents or close down some other badly needed program in order to find the money to pay for that disaster assistance. That, in essence, is the point of view that is controlling the consideration of this bill.

Now, some people are having difficulty understanding the term "faith-based initiative." I think an example might be our disaster assistance program. We are praying that we do not have any more storms. We are trying to preclude acts of God from getting in the way of our budget process. I think that is an arrogant way for human beings to go about legislating, but so be it; that apparently is the mindset around here.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, and this chart demonstrates one example, which shows what happened to one highway in Houston after the reign of terror in June of 2001. Currently, we are trying to cope with that huge gulf storm. Damage in a single county in Texas was estimated to be \$4.8 billion.

□ 1215

The director of FEMA called me and told me that he thought that it could be possible that they would need significant additional money above the amount already appropriated by this Congress, and when contacted by the Houston Chronicle, OMB director Daniels stated, and I quote, that "It is highly likely" that FEMA's budget will need another boost this year.

What is going to happen with this bill? OMB told my office last night they are not planning to make a request. They are hoping to slide by on existing funds. If everything goes right and if God decides that the weather is not going to operate the way it normally does, we may just make it through. But if we have a normal year and we have a couple of hurricanes after we leave here in August, what then? We are not going to have the money to respond to those disasters.

What are we going to do then? Are we going to go down to Texas and deobligate money that we have initially provided? I would hope not. But whatever happens, without additional funding, we will not be providing nor-

malcy to people who are affected by those storms.

Why is that? The reason is that all of the needs facing the Federal Government apparently must be met within a \$6.5 billion package. Why is that? That is because that number was picked out by Congress last December when we were trying to get out of here in time for Christmas.

Does that number have any relationship to the current projected surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare? No, it does not. Did we know at the time how much rising fuel costs would affect steaming costs for the Navy or training exercises in the Air Force? No, we did not. Did we know how much those costs would deplete spare parts inventories for aircraft, tank, and ships? No, we did not.

Did we know we were going to face major electricity blackouts in most of the western United States? No, we did not. Did we know we were going to have a severe storm hit the gulf coast in the month of June? No, we did not. I did not know that a tornado with 250 mile-an-hour winds was going to hit a town in my own congressional district.

We did not know any of those things. Yet, we are being told that we have to stick within that magic number because that is what the number was defined as last summer. That is a ridiculous way to legislate.

When this conference report comes back, it will be the last train through the station for the year. If Mitch Daniels or others at the White House think there is a high probability or even a significant probability that additional FEMA funds will be needed, and evidently they do, then they ought to ask for them, rather than to pretend that this problem does not exist.

In my view, we are playing a stupid numbers game with the lives of people who have already gone through a great deal just to insist that the numbers concocted in the middle of the night 8 months ago are the right numbers.

So consequently, I will be asking the House in this motion to do three things. First, I ask that we accept the Senate judgment and eliminate the action of the House in rescinding previously-approved money for FEMA. Everybody in this House knows that we are going to need that money. Let us fess up.

Secondly, I am going to ask that we instruct the conferees to recede to the Senate and accept the funds which the administration requested but the House deleted to deal with foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease.

Thirdly, I will ask the House to instruct conferees to recede to the Senate and accept the money needed to process the checks that are owed to victims of radiation exposure. Some of those people are extremely ill. Some have already died.

These are people who were exposed, in many instances unknowingly, to radiation as a result of the development,

testing, and transportation of radioactive material by the Federal Government. In other words, those people were fried by their own government. It seems to me that a government that can spend \$30 million on a political mailing to tell people that they are going to get a tax cut is a government that should not be simultaneously denying already-earned benefits to people who are dying and need that money now, not after they are in the grave.

I would also point out that the administration itself sent a letter commending the Senate "for not including the provision in the House-passed version of the bill that would have rescinded \$389 million in disaster relief funding for FEMA."

I would urge Members to listen to the administration on this item, and listen to us on the other two items, do what we know we are going to have to do, and instruct the conferees to accept these three items.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start by saying I appreciate the gentleman's comments about the bipartisan way we have been dealing with appropriation bills. He is exactly right, we have worked together very well. We have had some differences, but that is not unexpected nor unusual for the bill we are talking about now, the supplemental appropriations bill.

He mentioned the agriculture bill passing with about 90 percent aye votes. The truth of the matter is that the bill we are now discussing passed the House with 80 percent of the vote. So there was a very large vote in the House for the bill as the committee wrote it as modified by three amendments that were agreed to in the House during the debate on that bill.

So I appreciate the fact that we can work together. I think, before this is over, we will end up having worked together and produced a good conference report.

The difficulty with accepting a motion to instruct on a bill that does not have that many differences to start with is that it really ties the hands of the House negotiators. The gentleman from Wisconsin will be one of the chief negotiators when we go to conference with the Senate.

We should not do that negotiation here on the floor. That is why we have conference committees in the first place.

I was asking the gentleman to yield, but he was very busy with his statement and he did not yield. I was going to ask the gentleman, a question. He talked about the FEMA rescission in the House bill, and we did talk about that at length when we debated the bill on the floor on June 20. The fact is that this Congress, under the Republican majority or the Democratic majority, never ignored the needs of our commu-

nities when it came to disasters. Whatever funds were needed, we made them available. I do not think that is a concern.

I was going to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to amend his motion to recommit just to include the issue of FEMA. We would be happy to accept it if he would amend it. But we do not want to have our hands tied going into conference. We need the ability to negotiate with the other body, which is the same ability that the other body has to negotiate with us. Then we will produce a conference report that I think at least 80 percent of the House would agree with.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would like me to respond, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, let me simply say I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I think that demonstrates that even he understands that we need to reject what the House originally did with respect to FEMA.

But I would say that I cannot accept the gentleman's offer because I think there is no rational reason whatsoever for the House not to do what the Senate has already done and to provide the money that we badly need in the agricultural area, and to provide the money that we know we have a moral obligation to provide to the victims of radiation poisoning. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that we do not do conferences here on the floor of the House or on the floor of the Senate, we do the conferences in conference committees. We do that because there has to be give and take.

There has to be negotiation. If we adopt this motion to recommit, we tie the hands of the conferees. The other body will not tie the hands of their negotiators. So I think it is a mistake to adopt this motion to recommit.

As far as the FEMA issue is concerned, we have had numerous meetings already with the potential conferees in the other body. We are pretty much agreed that we have found other ways to provide that money without getting into the FEMA fund. So we do not really need that part of it.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin chaired the committee, he did not look favorably upon motions to instruct when he took the committee to conference because it tied his hands. That is the same thing here.

We do not have that many differences. We will be able to produce a good conference report that at least 80 percent of the House will agree to, but we need the flexibility. Do not tie our hands as we go to conference with the Senate, because their hands will not be tied in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to tie the hands of the conferees on these three items, because I think there is absolutely no reason for us to use these items as leverage.

I think the people who are eligible for these funds and need these funds need to know that they are going to get them, and the sooner we do that, the better off everybody is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me. I thank the chairman of the Committee for going to conference, because obviously I want to go to conference, but my concern is that we need to make sure we restore the funding to FEMA, and even look at the emergency needs that we will have, not just for my area in Houston, but all across the country.

I rise in support of the motion of the ranking member to instruct conferees, particularly the section on restoring funds for FEMA. The need for the money is real. Again, FEMA's budget is \$1.6 billion. The flood in Houston alone was \$5 billion. FEMA typically pays half of the loss, so that is \$2.5 billion. We will have more emergency needs in the last 3 or 4 months of the fiscal year.

I spoke earlier, but let me share with you a story of a frustration that I know a lot of people have when they have these floods. I have a senior citizen couple. He is 70 years old, she is 63. Their house was destroyed. They were on a fixed income. They live on \$2,000 a month. Their mortgage is paid off. The only thing they were eligible for was a small business loan. Granted, it was 4 percent, but because of their excellent credit rating, they were not eligible for a grant.

This 70-year-old individual and the 63-year-old person are now looking at a 30-year loan. How many of us are going to be paying our home mortgages at 100 years old, or at 93 years old? That is what worries me about not providing the adequate resources to FEMA, because we will see more of this. A senior citizen should not have to say, "I am going to sign a loan that is for 30 years because my house is destroyed."

That is what is frustrating. That is why we need to make sure we provide the money FEMA needs, not just eliminate the rescission of the \$389 million, but we need to provide what FEMA needs between now and October 1 for the losses in Houston, Texas, that we can see from here in this picture. This is not actually my district, this is downtown Houston. But can Members imagine some of the subdivisions that I represent? The water was that high above the homes. We are talking about hundreds and even thousands of homes that were damaged.

That is why we need to make sure that FEMA has that money restored.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the chairman of the full committee, and rise in very strong support of the Obey motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically address the portion of the motion to instruct that involves the \$35 million of the request for the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service as part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I would say that if Members have been paying any attention to the newspapers and see what is going on in Europe and in Latin America, they would see the pressures on our Department of Agriculture to keep out of our country these severe animal diseases that are just absolutely devastating both livestock and human lives in places around the world.

Our Department has a special new responsibility that they have been trying to augment with this supplementary appropriation bill. They have asked us for this \$35 million to hire additional custom inspectors and veterinarians, and to make sure we have a doubling or tripling of our canine force to try to detect animal and disease problems that may be entering our country.

This really is, I think, a difficult issue for many Americans, yes hard to understand. Life is pretty comfortable for the majority of people in our country. It is hard to understand that there actually could be such serious threats to our food chain. America has not had foot and mouth disease since 1929. But it spreads rapidly. And it will be devastating if it enters this country. We have seen mad cow disease do its damage to millions of animals and now to humans in Europe. Human beings are dying in Europe, in very developed economies, from this. These are almost, it seems, other-worldly experiences, but they could happen to us.

We really need this \$35 million to help the USDA. They have asked us for this money, and hopefully with this motion to instruct we will be able to get it. Mr. Speaker, the USDA continues to need the money. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who has just been so vigilant on this issue, will be talking about this in a minute. He has another letter from USDA seeking this assistance.

We had a vote in the subcommittee, in the full committee, very close, 27 to 35 when I offered it as an amendment. It was defeated on a close margin at that point, but I urge the conferees and I urge this House to consider this motion to instruct. Give us this \$35 million the Administration has requested. Keep America free of these exotic pests and serious animal diseases.

□ 1230

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

My friend from Ohio was just making some points about how we all want to work on stopping any threat from entering our borders and threatening livestock or people in this country from any problem that currently exists overseas. We are in total agreement on wanting to do all we can to stop this from entering our country in any way whatsoever. However, the solution that is being proposed in this motion to instruct is unnecessary because in fact there is a system in place already that can be accessed by the Secretary of Agriculture on a moment's notice if something were to occur in this country.

We have gone over this over and over again as we have moved separately on our agriculture appropriations bill in pointing this out clearly, and we even asked and reviewed with the Secretary that the money that she could access would amount to \$30 billion. We are talking about an amount here of \$35 million that, when compared to that \$30 billion, is a drop in the bucket in terms of what would be necessary to fight whatever threat may enter our borders.

The Secretary gets that authorization from a program that was implemented 20 years ago for the Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service. Twenty years ago, in response to an avian influenza catastrophe, we included the following language in our annual appropriations bill, which has served the purpose over the years, and I read from that bill: "In addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agriculture production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants."

Mr. Speaker, we have carried this language each year for the past 20 years, and this language does permit the Secretary to simply declare that an emergency exists and that simple language would then allow the Secretary to fully access the Commodity Credit Corporation, through that corporation, a \$30 billion entity, to take whatever action is necessary to address the emergency. We feel strongly this is the proper approach; and this permits the Secretary to meet any need much faster than waiting for congressional action, followed by OMB apportionment and treasury warrants, and everything else that is required by this action.

So the system that is in place now we feel very confident would address any threat that could enter our country. And if, in fact, it was not, we would

have sufficient time to review what threat could possibly enter our country and deal with it appropriately. But to pull a figure out of thin air of \$35 million at this point and to say we must insist this money goes into the budget is unnecessary, and I guess an exercise in caution that some feel we need to take but is absolutely not something we need to do at this time.

I, therefore, oppose this motion to instruct and urge its defeat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply point out, Mr. Speaker, the administration has asked for the FEMA money. The Congress is rescinding it. The gentleman says this money for agriculture was pulled out of the air. This is the administration request that we are simply trying to comply with.

Thirdly, the radiation item is an item which is owed people who are dying, at least in part because of the action of their own government. I think it will be very difficult for Members to explain their opposition to any of these three items.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for including in this motion language that would instruct conferees to accept the Senate provision to provide \$35 million for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, as requested by the Bush administration, to protect American agriculture from serious animal disease threats like foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease.

Unless we take steps now to protect ourselves, an outbreak of these diseases could be absolutely catastrophic for our country. My State of North Carolina is a good example of that. One estimate says that if foot and mouth disease were to break out in certain counties in eastern North Carolina, with concentrated hog operations, within a 20-mile perimeter we would have to destroy more animals than were destroyed in all of the country of England.

Our Governor, Mike Easley, and agriculture commissioner Meg Scott Phipps have worked hard on a prevention effort, but the States need help from the Federal Government. Now, earlier this year Secretary Veneman did authorize the use of \$32 million in APHIS funding for foot and mouth and mad cow disease border inspection activities. During our debate in the Committee on Appropriations, we were advised that this and other funds available from the Commodity Credit Corporation were sufficient; that USDA had adequate resources to address foreign animal disease. That, however, was not accurate. And I am amazed to hear the subcommittee chairman repeating that argument this morning.

The President, 8 weeks after Secretary Veneman made these funds available, requested \$35 million in supplemental funding for APHIS. I have confirmed with the Agriculture Department just this morning that we still need this \$35 million in supplemental funding and that without it the Agriculture Department does not have adequate resources to protect the United States against foreign animal diseases. It is amazing to me, it totally escapes me, how we would not want to prepare ourselves for what could be an absolutely devastating outbreak.

We have to do all we can to protect this country against the threat of foreign animal diseases. We should honor the administration's well-justified request and accept the position of the Senate on this \$35 million for the Agriculture Department. So I urge adoption of the motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman is ready to close, as he has the right to do in this particular case, as I have no further requests at this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of the gentleman. The last time we were in this situation the gentleman did not use a lot of his time and at the end took about a 10-minute block with several speakers. Is the gentleman indicating that he has no additional speakers except himself?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. No, I just thought I would save a little time. I might have a few closing remarks for our side prior to the gentleman closing.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 22 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I think this is an excellent motion to instruct, and one of the things this motion does is seek to remedy a long overdue injustice.

U.S. Citizens who went to work in uranium mines and downwinders who lived below atomic bomb explosions have suffered severely at the hands of the United States Government. Government doctors knew they were in danger. The Atomic Energy Commission knew they were in danger. But nobody told them, when they were working in the mines, the mines were dirty and they were going to get lung cancer. Nobody told the people living downwind that they were in danger.

These victims had to go to court to try to seek justice. And they lost in the courts, and the courts came back

and said, this situation cries out for justice. Finally, in 1990, the U.S. Congress acted and corrected that injustice and said compensation should be paid and a national apology be given to these individuals. Very few occasions in our Nation's industry has that occurred.

Many of these victims are Navajo Indians who live in the remotest part of the country. They knew nothing of the dangers, and they are entitled to this compensation. But guess what, my colleagues, the government is out of money. The government account is empty, and we are issuing IOUs to those people. We are issuing IOUs to elderly Navajo widows who have large families. We are issuing IOUs to people that are living and have lung cancer and are waiting for this payment, many waiting for 25 years. There are 438 IOUs totaling \$31 million.

This is a national outrage, and this motion to instruct will tell the House conferees to accede to the Senate number and put the money in there and do justice.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I too rise in strong support of this motion to instruct, especially its support for payments under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, or as it is known, RECA.

The people covered by RECA include uranium miners and millers and others who worked to support our nuclear weapons program and those people who were exposed to fallout unknowingly from our program. Because of that exposure, they are sick, sick with cancers and other serious diseases. Many of them are residents of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, people like Merle and Richard Leavell of Cortez, Colorado, or Eugene Cox of Montrose.

When Congress enacted this law, we promised to pay compensation for these illnesses, but we have not kept that promise. We have not appropriated enough money to pay everyone who is entitled to be paid. The Department of Justice tells me that on July 6, the end of last week, they had sent 438 people letters that are basically IOUs. Those people should have gotten checks that would have totaled \$31 million. In Colorado, 51 Coloradans have received these IOU letters. They should have been paid \$5 million.

What the letters say is that the payment must wait for further appropriations. What the letters mean is that we in the Congress have failed to meet a solemn obligation. Now, the Senate put the \$84 million back in the bill for these RECA payments. So it is important that the House accept that addition. That is all this motion to instruct says that should happen and that is why we must approve this motion today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I remember sitting and listening to these work-

ers in the State of Colorado and looking into their eyes and hearing them speak about how important it was not just for the money but for the principle of this. This is an apology, and this is also an affirmation that the work that they did is work that has not been done in vain. We need to acknowledge the debt we owe to these Americans that put their lives on the line.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 22 minutes remaining?

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman intend to use any more of his time? I only have, I believe, two speakers.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I intend to use just a few minutes prior to the gentleman closing on his motion. Other than that, I have no further speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate the gentleman for submitting this motion to instruct that includes doing the right thing. The Senate recognized it is the right thing to provide this funding for victims of exposure to radiation.

It is interesting. We have a problem in our country where people tend to sometimes lose faith in their government. Here in Congress we stood up, I was not here at the time, but Congress stood up years ago and said, the government did something wrong and we are going to admit responsibility for doing something wrong in terms of inappropriately exposing people to radiation and so we are going to compensate these people. But at this point, it looks like Congress was talking a good game; but they are not backing it up with the actual funds.

I have met so many people who have these letters in hand, these promises that someday we are going to give you this money. These are people that went through the process of filing a claim, filling out all the forms, going through their history, and the government then said, yes, you do qualify, but, gee, we do not have any money. That is just not acceptable.

I challenge anyone in this body to look one of these victims in the eye and say, well, we do not have enough money for you. We are going to spend \$35 million to send a letter to everyone telling them they are going to get a tax rebate, but we do not have enough money to compensate you while you are sick and dying from cancers caused by this Government. These actions have affected people in my State and in my own family.

It is time for Congress to stand up and do what is right and fund this. I encourage everyone to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I thank him for this motion.

I stand in strong support of this motion, particularly the portion that gives a certain amount, \$35 million, to APHIS. We wish we did not have to call for this emergency, but all of us are keenly aware of the outbreak in England in February of 2001. I can tell my colleagues that it affects all of the United States, but it has a particularly devastating potential effect for the State of North Carolina.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from our Governor to President Bush. It is a copy of a letter that goes to President Bush from the commissioner of agriculture as well as the President pro tempore and our Speaker of the House.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Raleigh, NC, March 29, 2001.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,  
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

Hon. ANN VENEMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH AND SECRETARY VENEMAN: As you are aware, since being confirmed in England on February 19, 2001, Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) has been extremely active in many sections of the world, culminating in the catastrophic events that have occurred in the United Kingdom and parts of Western Europe over the past 18 months.

Introduction of this virus into the United States remains to be seen, but we do know that it would bring catastrophic consequences to the animal livestock industry, with direct and indirect financial losses in the billions of dollars. Of particular concern here in North Carolina is our extensive swine industry (10 million animals), as well as our precious beef and dairy cattle commodities (950,000 head). We have been working diligently over the past month strengthening our safety net towards minimizing the risk of the introduction of the disease into our state and country.

Because FMD is a foreign animal disease, the USDA has primary jurisdiction over the prevention and eradication of this disease. Through the efforts of our State Veterinarian in the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, as well as the efforts of members of our General Assembly, we are strengthening the procedures we have in place in North Carolina for disease eradication. However, we have serious concerns that we believe can only be addressed by a stronger USDA, APHIS effort.

The USDA, APHIS should be urged to do the following:

1. To promptly conduct a full risk assessment, particularly identifying the most likely methods of entry of FMD into the U.S., and implement risk management plans of action based upon the identified or perceived risks.

2. To immediately ban all used farm equipment and supplies (including harness and tack) from FMD countries until further notice. Future action would depend upon the outcome of the USDA, APHIS risk assessment and risk management plan.

3. To work with appropriate federal agencies to immediately install effective sanitary footbaths at the point of entry for all international conveyances (by air, sea, land) and complete surveillance and decontamination of all cargo. It should be mandatory that all passengers pass through the footbath upon disembarkation.

4. To conduct a thorough and complete compliance review of the disposal of international garbage from foreign conveyances (by air, sea, land).

5. To work with appropriate federal agencies to ensure that all foreign conveyances (by air, sea, and land) are appropriately decontaminated of possible FMD virus.

6. To immediately enter into active discussions with FEMA officials with the intent of proactively developing a national Emergency Support Function (ESF) for animal industry, with USDA being the primary responsible agency. The ESF should address both natural disaster and animal health emergencies of national importance. In addition, technical advice and assistance should be provided to states to develop regional compacts between state emergency management agencies.

7. To review the FMD diagnostic capabilities at the Foreign Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory on Plum Island and develop a plan of action to enhance capabilities to an appropriate level. Such plan of action should consider approaching Congress to allow FMD testing at certified state laboratories.

8. To notify the AVIC and State Veterinarian in the state of destination in advance of imported animals/animal products.

9. To immediately and thoroughly review all livestock import protocols at points of entry for Mexico and Canada.

10. To thoroughly review the manufacturing and distribution capabilities of FMD vaccine and the impact of its use in an FMD eradication program.

11. To work with appropriate federal agencies to ensure full surveillance and decontamination of international parcel post packages.

12. To consider the benefits of restricting the importation of any grooming, training, or riding equipment/supplies for imported equine, with the exception of a halter and lead rope.

13. To notify NASDA of the results of above, including needed resources, in order to develop partnerships to help procure necessary resources to fully implement risk management plans.

14. To ensure that funds are available for indemnification to the producer as provided by federal law.

Many of these suggestions were developed by the Georgia Department of Agriculture and forwarded to the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA). The State Commissioners and Directors of Agriculture have held several telephone conferences regarding this situation and have expressed similar concerns.

We must be extremely diligent in our efforts to prevent the introduction of this disease into the United States. Your assistance in this will be greatly appreciated.

With kindest regards, we remain

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL F. EASLEY,  
Governor.

MEG SCOTT PHIPPS,  
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SENATOR MARC BASNIGHT,  
President Pro Tempore.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES B. BLACK,  
Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, let me just quote from this.

He wrote to each of us in the North Carolina delegation. He called to our attention that North Carolina would be affected greatly. I will not enter this into the RECORD because it will not come out right, but if indeed there was an outbreak, we can see that poultry, dairy and indeed all the livestock would be immediately impacted. Within 5 to 15 miles, we will have a devastation on our hands unseen before in the United States. So they are calling not only because they need to have staff, they also are putting more resources of their own.

I entered into the supplemental bill an amendment in the Committee on Agriculture, when we considered the agricultural supplement, to put \$50 million. They could not do it within the amount of money they had. This gives the House the opportunity independently to do this. I would think we would want to do that. We would not want to have the outbreak.

Let us do the right thing and prevent the outbreak by giving sufficient money that the staff can be equipped to handle such a devastation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the purposeful way in which the appropriations process has proceeded under his leadership. But it is also true that this motion to instruct draws our attention to some very serious deficiencies in the budgetary process which are becoming more obvious with the passage of every day.

The White House today tells us that the anticipated budget surplus of \$200 billion for the year is down very, very substantially, by more than \$30 billion, more than 15 percent.

It is very likely that if disaster strikes from natural causes or if we have an invasion of foreign animal disease strike our shores, that we will respond appropriately with the necessary funds. But the question arises where are those funds going to come from if we do not budget for them in the first instance.

Increasingly one is driven to conclude that the answer to that question is going to be from places like the Medicare Trust Fund initially and perhaps even the Social Security Trust Fund if that becomes necessary. That is why this motion to instruct is very appropriate. Every Member of this House ought to give it their very careful consideration.

We are not being honest in the way we are dealing with the people's money here. We are living in a time of budget



surpluses, but those surpluses are going down day after day, week after week. If we do not anticipate our needs honestly and appropriately now, sure as we are standing here, we are going to be digging into those trust funds, and the security of our senior citizens who rely upon the Medicare Trust Fund to get their health care needs will be put into jeopardy.

This motion to instruct is very appropriate, very pointed, and we ought to pass it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he might use to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder when we listen to debate in this Chamber if we are not made up of a lot of Chicken Littles with concerns about the money that is put in here for APHIS and trying to prevent the diseases from coming over here. They are not here.

There is absolutely no threat at this point domestically to any of us, humans, plants, animals, because our systems work. We are working every day in a bipartisan way to make sure that we remain safe from these threats that have devastated other countries.

Can anybody guarantee that nothing is going to happen? Of course not. That is why we have over and over again talked to the Secretary and communicated with everyone involved who could possibly have a role in preventing these diseases from entering our country to make sure we are doing everything we can.

Even though there was a request by the administration in this area, we reviewed that with the Secretary of Agriculture over and over again, specifically to find out if she could access this multibillion-dollar fund if, in fact, something happened.

There is also a plan in place that, looking a step further, assuming that the sky does fall and Chicken Little is finally right, there would be an indemnity program for livestock if something were to occur. Of course, we cannot predict, and all we can do is do all we can to be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I believe in a bipartisan way in this House we should feel comfortable that we are doing all we can, but to stand up and say over and over again, oh, my goodness, we have to pour more money in for inspectors and so forth, it is not prudent. You cannot live by the fact that something terrible may happen every day. Let us be optimistic and look at the positives in the bill. We should feel good about that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say there is already a multibillion-dollar fund available for this purpose?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, there is \$30 billion that the Secretary of Agriculture could access if one of these threats entered our country domestically.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would continue to yield, that money is available today?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary could access that, that is correct. If the Secretary or we in this room agreed in a bipartisan way that it was not enough, we could come back and deal with that at the appropriate time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that very revealing information.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the motion to instruct and the time to respond to a crucial provision, and that is to insist that no provision to rescind funds from the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund be included in the conference report.

We might think this is a benign instruction, but as we move this supplemental to the floor, many of us have to rise and oppose the rescinding of \$329 million, as well as attempting to add more dollars, as the Senate had informed us that FEMA at that time, rather than a billion dollars that was discussed on this floor in their coffers, only had about \$178 million.

Mr. Speaker, we are devastated in Houston by Tropical Storm Allison. In my community and the surrounding area alone, 5,000 homes were destroyed. The University of Houston is suffering about \$100 million and growing worth of damage; the Medical Center, \$2.2 billion and growing; St. Joseph's Hospital, \$60 million; Texas Southern University, another institution of learning, also with damages that are not covered by flood insurance; and many, many people in my community who have not yet filed their FEMA application.

Mr. Speaker, we need more resources. Tropical Storm Allison dumped 36 inches. It was an unpredictable storm. Many people lost their lives, and this is a vital instruction to be able to provide the necessary funds to help those who are still recovering.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have only one remaining speaker, me.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat something that I said at the beginning of the debate in opposition to the motion to instruct. On the issue of FEMA, this Congress never ignored the issues of our communities when it came to natural disasters, and I hope that we never will.

Mr. Speaker, as I offered to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY)

early in the debate, if he would amend his motion just to deal with FEMA, we would be prepared to accept it, but we are not prepared to accept a motion to instruct that really ties our hands when we go to negotiate with the other body.

One of my colleagues on the other side mentioned Social Security and Medicare. The only way we would use any money set aside for Social Security and Medicare is if those who cannot control their appetite for spending have their way. We are doing the best we can to hold the line on spending so we do not use any monies from Social Security and Medicare funds. I understand that there are demands for more spending on not only this issue, but every issue that comes before us. But we have to constrain our appetites for spending by the Federal Government.

An example of what I am talking about, several of my colleagues talked about 438 outstanding payments, worth \$31 million, on point number 3 on the motion to instruct. Well, if that is the case, why would we have to go to \$84 million if all we need is the \$31 million? I use that as an example. We need to work out these figures, work out these disagreements, and come together on them.

All in all, before I yield back my time, and before the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) closes on his motion, this motion is asking us on the conference committee to cave in to our brothers and sisters in the Senate before we ever go to conference. That is not why we go to conference. We go to conference to work out the differences. If our ability to negotiate is taken away, then the product we bring back may or may not be an acceptable product.

Mr. Speaker, let us dispose of this motion to instruct now. Let us go to conference, do the best we can to represent the interests of the House of Representatives, and bring back a conference report that is really needed. It is late. This supplemental appropriations needs to get passed and sent to the President. Let us get to our job. Let us do the negotiating. Let us bring back a conference report on the supplemental that 80 percent or more of the House can agree to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking the House of Representatives today to approve three items which are supported by the Republican administration.

Number one, FEMA. The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration tells us we are going to need more money. The OMB Director is quoted in print as saying we will need more money for disaster assistance. Yet this House, without this motion, will be supporting a proposition that cuts from existing funds \$389 million for disaster assistance. This issue is not about spending more money, it is



about telling the truth about what our spending plans are.

Secondly, the administration has asked for the money to protect us from foot-and-mouth disease and from mad cow disease. The gentleman from Texas said our system works well. "Do not worry, no worry." Well, I would ask my colleagues to recognize what the administration itself has said. "Given the various foreign animal disease outbreaks in other parts of the world this year, USDA has been conducting a top-to-bottom review of its core programs to ensure we have the necessary resources to protect American agriculture from devastating animal diseases. These additional funds will help strengthen these important programs. MFD is a highly contagious and economically devastating disease. It is one of the animal diseases that livestock owners dread most because it spreads widely and rapidly, and because it has grave economic consequences."

□ 1300

The way to save money is to spend it on prevention. You do not wait until the epidemic hits and then try to do something. It is too late. We already have had to destroy virtually every citrus tree in Florida because of citrus canker from a blight that was not supposed to come into the United States, either. I would say caution ought to be the watchword here.

Lastly, the gentleman says we do not need the \$82 million to pay the victims of radiation poisoning. These are people who are dying, at least in part, because of the action of their own government, and they did not know that they were being exposed to danger. I would point out that the Justice Department itself says that we need \$82 million this year; not \$31 million, \$81 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I was just going by what the speakers on the gentleman's side said, that it was \$31 million that they needed.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, I would prefer to go by what we know. We are told by the Republican Justice Department, not us, that we need \$81 million. In each of the three cases, what we are asking you to do is to put in what your own administration has said we will need to spend.

This is not about spending levels. It is about truth-in-budgeting. It is about fessing up to what we actually will have to spend in the end. There is no point in hiding from ourselves what the actual costs of these items will be. Every single one of these items has been requested by the administration. Every single one of these items is in the national interest. Every single one of these dollars will have to be spent in the end. We might as well be honest and face up to it now.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues to support a mo-

tion to instruct conferees to eliminate the \$389 million rescission from FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund included in the House version that was not included in the Senate version. I went to the Rules Committee and came to the floor in mid-June to oppose this rescission because I knew the extent of the growing burden from the most current damage assessments and visits to my district and the area. FEMA, OMB, and Senator HUTCHISON from Texas held my same original position on this rescission. I do not completely fault the House Appropriations Committee for initially targeting the Disaster Relief Fund because when they began drafting this bill there was no tropical storm Allison. However, I was very disappointed in the sometimes ugly accusations sent my way that I was playing political games with disaster relief. Instead of politics, let us look at the arithmetic.

The fund currently has only \$583 billion in contingency appropriations which OMB expects to be released soon. The fund also has over \$200 million in normal appropriated funds, leaving the Disaster Relief Fund with roughly \$800 million. The original funds that the rescission had targeted has been spent. The money the House Appropriations Committee thought was available for a rescission is gone, due to the unpredictable financial burden of tropical storm Allison. So far, 85,000 Texans have filed for assistance and FEMA has disbursed well over \$300 million, and many sources close to the recovery operation are predicting that federal obligations for recovery will reach \$2 billion in Texas alone.

I would like to relate the recent development since we debated this issue in mid-June. The Senate's version of the bill eliminates the rescission and includes an extra \$1 million as a placeholder for additional funds. OMB's latest statements say that more, certainly not less, money will be needed in the Disaster Relief Fund this year. Let me stress this again: the Bush administration says it is "highly likely" to request emergency supplemental funds for the Disaster Relief Fund in 2001. I hope this stance by a very fiscally conservative administration will convince my colleagues that I was only reacting to nonpartisan arithmetic—there simply was not going to be enough Disaster Relief Fund moneys to pay for repairs in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and Pennsylvania. The administration recognized the situation back in June, and I am confident that the House Appropriations Committee is well aware of the Disaster Relief Fund situation now. I ask them, in light of the well-publicized financial situation of the fund, to join me in support of this Motion to Instruct Conferees.

Damage from tropical storm Allison has been appraised at \$4.88 billion in Harris County (Houston), TX. I have heard from the hospitals and medical schools of the Texas Medical Center that damage assessments are \$2 billion to state-of-the-art, nonprofit health care facilities, 25–30 percent of which is estimated to be covered by insurance. Add this to the fact that over 50,000 Texans in Harris County alone are either in temporary housing or working to make their homes livable again. Given the incredible extent of the damage resulting from tropical storm Allison, the administration is predicting that additional funds will be needed in fiscal year 2001 in addition to the rescission which I urgently hope will be restored. FEMA, the administration, Senator KAY BAILEY

HUTCHISON, and I believe that as much as \$1 billion may be needed in additional funds for 2001. As far as I know, Congress rarely failed to come to the aid of a locality stricken by a major natural disaster. I am sure that the Appropriations Committee would not remove a large percentage of funding from the DRF, against the wishes of the administration, when disaster bills from a destructive deadly storm are rising steadily and depleting the DRF.

Finally, I want to remind my colleagues that 28 disaster declarations have already been made in the first half of 2001. At the beginning of hurricane and wildfire season, I think it is a mistake to be undermining FEMA's primary method of assistance, the Disaster Relief Fund.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. BRADY and CULBERSON, join me in casting our votes against the motion to instruct because it attempted to tie the hands of appropriators as we go to conference. This procedural vote is a party line vote and has no practical effect on Houston.

We can, should, and will continue to meet our commitment to Allison's victims and still meet our commitment to fiscal responsibility. Similarly, we can, should, and will continue to put people before politics.

While it was premature and petty for the Democrats to essentially try to go to conference on the House floor today, rest assured that we will continue to work together for Houston in the most prudent, responsible, and effective way. Notwithstanding the demagoguery from the other side, Houston has nothing to fear.

The Appropriations chairman indicated during the debate on the Democrats' motion to instruct conferees on the supplemental that if they would limit their motion to just the removal of the FEMA rescission, he would accept it. The Democrats declined his offer.

"We will provide whatever funds are necessary to meet these disasters in Texas and nationwide. We have always done so. We will meet our responsibilities with the necessary dollars," said Chairman YOUNG.

We express our appreciation to Chairman YOUNG for his commitment to the victims of tropical storm Allison and vow to fight to restore funds to FEMA as the bill moves through conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 219, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

## YEAS—205

|             |                    |               |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Ackerman    | Hall (OH)          | Moran (VA)    |
| Allen       | Hall (TX)          | Nadler        |
| Andrews     | Harman             | Napolitano    |
| Baca        | Hastings (FL)      | Neal          |
| Baird       | Hill               | Oberstar      |
| Baldacci    | Hilliard           | Obey          |
| Baldwin     | Hinchey            | Olver         |
| Barcia      | Hinojosa           | Ortiz         |
| Barrett     | Hoeffel            | Owens         |
| Becerra     | Holden             | Pallone       |
| Bentsen     | Holt               | Pascarell     |
| Berkley     | Honda              | Pastor        |
| Berry       | Hooley             | Payne         |
| Bishop      | Hoyer              | Pelosi        |
| Blagojevich | Inslee             | Peterson (MN) |
| Blumenauer  | Israel             | Phelps        |
| Bonior      | Jackson (IL)       | Price (NC)    |
| Borski      | Jackson-Lee        | Rahall        |
| Boswell     | (TX)               | Rangel        |
| Boucher     | Jefferson          | Reyes         |
| Boyd        | Jenkins            | Rivers        |
| Brady (PA)  | John               | Rodriguez     |
| Brown (FL)  | Johnson, E. B.     | Roemer        |
| Brown (OH)  | Jones (OH)         | Ross          |
| Capps       | Kanjorski          | Rothman       |
| Capuano     | Kaptur             | Roybal-Allard |
| Cardin      | Kennedy (RI)       | Rush          |
| Carson (IN) | Kildee             | Sabo          |
| Carson (OK) | Kilpatrick         | Sanders       |
| Clay        | Kind (WI)          | Sandlin       |
| Clayton     | Kleczka            | Sawyer        |
| Clement     | Kucinich           | Schakowsky    |
| Clyburn     | LaFalce            | Schiff        |
| Condit      | Lampson            | Scott         |
| Conyers     | Langevin           | Serrano       |
| Costello    | Lantos             | Sherman       |
| Coyne       | Larsen (WA)        | Shows         |
| Cramer      | Larson (CT)        | Skelton       |
| Crowley     | Lee                | Slaughter     |
| Cummings    | Levin              | Smith (WA)    |
| Davis (CA)  | Lewis (GA)         | Snyder        |
| Davis (FL)  | Lipinski           | Solis         |
| Davis (IL)  | Lofgren            | Spratt        |
| DeFazio     | Lowey              | Stark         |
| DeGette     | Lucas (KY)         | Stenholm      |
| Delahunt    | Luther             | Strickland    |
| DeLauro     | Maloney (CT)       | Stupak        |
| Deutsch     | Maloney (NY)       | Tanner        |
| Dicks       | Markey             | Tauscher      |
| Dingell     | Mascara            | Taylor (MS)   |
| Doggett     | Matheson           | Thompson (CA) |
| Dooley      | Matsui             | Thompson (MS) |
| Doyle       | McCarthy (MO)      | Thurman       |
| Edwards     | McCarthy (NY)      | Tierney       |
| Engel       | McCollum           | Towns         |
| Eshoo       | McGovern           | Turner        |
| Etheridge   | McInnis            | Udall (CO)    |
| Evans       | McIntyre           | Udall (NM)    |
| Farr        | McKinney           | Velazquez     |
| Fattah      | McNulty            | Visclosky     |
| Filner      | Meehan             | Waters        |
| Ford        | Meek (FL)          | Watson (CA)   |
| Frank       | Meeks (NY)         | Watt (NC)     |
| Frost       | Menendez           | Waxman        |
| Gephardt    | Millender-McDonald | Weiner        |
| Gonzalez    | Mink               | Wexler        |
| Gordon      | Mollohan           | Woolsey       |
| Green (TX)  | Moore              | Wu            |
| Gutierrez   |                    | Wynn          |

## NAYS—219

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Callahan      | Doolittle     |
| Aderholt    | Calvert       | Dreier        |
| Akin        | Camp          | Duncan        |
| Armey       | Cannon        | Dunn          |
| Bachus      | Cantor        | Ehlers        |
| Baker       | Capito        | Ehrlich       |
| Ballenger   | Castle        | Emerson       |
| Barr        | Chabot        | English       |
| Bartlett    | Chambliss     | Everett       |
| Barton      | Coble         | Ferguson      |
| Bass        | Collins       | Flake         |
| Bereuter    | Combest       | Fletcher      |
| Biggert     | Cooksey       | Foley         |
| Bilirakis   | Cox           | Forbes        |
| Blunt       | Crane         | Fossella      |
| Boehlert    | Crenshaw      | Frelinghuysen |
| Boehner     | Cubin         | Galleghy      |
| Bonilla     | Culberson     | Ganske        |
| Bono        | Cunningham    | Gekas         |
| Brady (TX)  | Davis, Jo Ann | Gibbons       |
| Brown (SC)  | Davis, Tom    | Gilchrest     |
| Bryant      | Deal          | Gillmor       |
| Burr        | DeLay         | Gilman        |
| Burton      | DeMint        | Goode         |
| Buyer       | Diaz-Balart   | Goodlatte     |

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Goss          | Lucas (OK)    | Schrock       |
| Graham        | Manzullo      | Sensenbrenner |
| Granger       | McCrery       | Sessions      |
| Graves        | McHugh        | Shadegg       |
| Green (WI)    | McKeon        | Shaw          |
| Greenwood     | Mica          | Shays         |
| Grucci        | Miller (FL)   | Sherwood      |
| Gutknecht     | Miller, Gary  | Shimkus       |
| Hansen        | Moran (KS)    | Shuster       |
| Hart          | Morella       | Simmons       |
| Hastings (WA) | Murtha        | Simpson       |
| Hayes         | Myrick        | Skeen         |
| Hayworth      | Nethercutt    | Smith (MI)    |
| Hefley        | Ney           | Smith (NJ)    |
| Herger        | Northup       | Smith (TX)    |
| Hilleary      | Norwood       | Souder        |
| Hobson        | Nussle        | Spence        |
| Hoekstra      | Osborne       | Stearns       |
| Horn          | Ose           | Stump         |
| Hostettler    | Otter         | Sununu        |
| Houghton      | Oxley         | Sweeney       |
| Hulshof       | Pence         | Tancredo      |
| Hunter        | Peterson (PA) | Tauzin        |
| Hutchinson    | Petri         | Taylor (NC)   |
| Hyde          | Pickering     | Terry         |
| Isakson       | Pitts         | Thomas        |
| Issa          | Platts        | Thornberry    |
| Istook        | Pombo         | Thune         |
| Johnson (CT)  | Portman       | Tiahrt        |
| Johnson (IL)  | Pryce (OH)    | Tiberi        |
| Johnson, Sam  | Quinn         | Toomey        |
| Jones (NC)    | Radanovich    | Trafigant     |
| Keller        | Ramstad       | Upton         |
| Kelly         | Regula        | Vitter        |
| Kennedy (MN)  | Rehberg       | Walden        |
| Kerns         | Reynolds      | Walsh         |
| King (NY)     | Riley         | Wamp          |
| Kingston      | Rogers (KY)   | Watkins (OK)  |
| Knollenberg   | Rogers (MI)   | Watts (OK)    |
| Kolbe         | Rohrabacher   | Weldon (FL)   |
| LaHood        | Ros-Lehtinen  | Weldon (PA)   |
| Largent       | Roukema       | Weller        |
| Latham        | Royce         | Whitfield     |
| LaTourette    | Ryan (WI)     | Wicker        |
| Leach         | Ryun (KS)     | Wilson        |
| Lewis (KY)    | Saxton        | Wolf          |
| Linder        | Scarborough   | Young (AK)    |
| LoBiondo      | Schaffer      | Young (FL)    |

## NOT VOTING—9

|            |                |         |
|------------|----------------|---------|
| Berman     | McDermott      | Pomeroy |
| Kirk       | Miller, George | Putnam  |
| Lewis (CA) | Paul           | Sanchez |

□ 1323

Mr. SAXTON and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. McINNIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 225 on June 12, 2001. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 225, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on rollcall 225, the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2216. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, ROGERS of Kentucky, SKEEN, WOLF, KOLBE, CALLAHAN, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, ISTOOK, BONILLA, KNOLLENBERG, OBEY, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, HOYER, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. OLVER.

There was no objection.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 6, noes 418, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

## AYES—6

|         |           |         |
|---------|-----------|---------|
| Conyers | Hall (OH) | McNulty |
| Filner  | Israel    | Serrano |

## NOES—418

|             |               |                |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Clyburn       | Gilchrest      |
| Ackerman    | Coble         | Gillmor        |
| Aderholt    | Collins       | Gilman         |
| Akin        | Combest       | Gonzalez       |
| Allen       | Condit        | Goode          |
| Andrews     | Cooksey       | Goodlatte      |
| Armey       | Costello      | Gordon         |
| Baca        | Cox           | Goss           |
| Bachus      | Coyne         | Graham         |
| Baird       | Cramer        | Granger        |
| Baker       | Crane         | Graves         |
| Baldacci    | Crenshaw      | Green (TX)     |
| Baldwin     | Crowley       | Green (WI)     |
| Ballenger   | Cubin         | Greenwood      |
| Barcia      | Culberson     | Grucci         |
| Barr        | Cummings      | Gutierrez      |
| Barrett     | Cunningham    | Gutknecht      |
| Bartlett    | Davis (CA)    | Hall (TX)      |
| Barton      | Davis (FL)    | Hansen         |
| Bass        | Davis (IL)    | Harman         |
| Becerra     | Davis, Jo Ann | Hart           |
| Bentsen     | Davis, Tom    | Hastings (FL)  |
| Bereuter    | Deal          | Hastings (WA)  |
| Berkley     | DeFazio       | Hayes          |
| Berry       | DeGette       | Hayworth       |
| Biggert     | Delahunt      | Hefley         |
| Bilirakis   | DeLauro       | Herger         |
| Bishop      | DeLay         | Hill           |
| Blagojevich | DeMint        | Hilleary       |
| Blumenauer  | Deutsch       | Hilliard       |
| Blunt       | Diaz-Balart   | Hinchey        |
| Boehlert    | Dicks         | Hinojosa       |
| Boehner     | Dingell       | Hobson         |
| Bonilla     | Doggett       | Hoeffel        |
| Bonior      | Doolittle     | Hoekstra       |
| Bono        | Doyle         | Holden         |
| Borski      | Dreier        | Holt           |
| Boswell     | Duncan        | Honda          |
| Boucher     | Dunn          | Hooley         |
| Boyd        | Edwards       | Horn           |
| Brady (PA)  | Ehlers        | Hostettler     |
| Brady (TX)  | Ehrlich       | Houghton       |
| Brown (FL)  | Emerson       | Hoyer          |
| Brown (OH)  | Engel         | Hulshof        |
| Brown (SC)  | English       | Hunter         |
| Bryant      | Eshoo         | Hutchinson     |
| Burr        | Etheridge     | Hyde           |
| Burton      | Evans         | Inslee         |
| Buyer       | Everett       | Isakson        |
| Callahan    | Farr          | Issa           |
| Calvert     | Fattah        | Istook         |
| Camp        | Ferguson      | Jackson (IL)   |
| Cannon      | Flake         | Jackson-Lee    |
| Cantor      | Fletcher      | (TX)           |
| Capito      | Foley         | Jefferson      |
| Capps       | Forbes        | Jenkins        |
| Capuano     | Ford          | John           |
| Cardin      | Fossella      | Johnson (CT)   |
| Carson (IN) | Frank         | Johnson (IL)   |
| Carson (OK) | Frelinghuysen | Johnson, E. B. |
| Castle      | Frost         | Johnson, Sam   |
| Chabot      | Galleghy      | Jones (NC)     |
| Chambliss   | Ganske        | Jones (OH)     |
| Clay        | Gekas         | Kanjorski      |
| Clayton     | Gephardt      | Kaptur         |
| Clement     | Gibbons       | Keller         |

|                |               |               |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Kelly          | Nethercutt    | Sherwood      |
| Kennedy (MN)   | Ney           | Shimkus       |
| Kennedy (RI)   | Northup       | Shows         |
| Kerns          | Norwood       | Shuster       |
| Kildee         | Nussle        | Simmons       |
| Kind (WI)      | Oberstar      | Simpson       |
| King (NY)      | Obey          | Skeen         |
| Kingston       | Oliver        | Skeltton      |
| Kirk           | Ortiz         | Slaughter     |
| Kleczyka       | Osborne       | Smith (MI)    |
| Knollenberg    | Ose           | Smith (NJ)    |
| Kolbe          | Otter         | Smith (TX)    |
| Kucinich       | Owens         | Smith (WA)    |
| LaFalce        | Oxley         | Snyder        |
| LaHood         | Pallone       | Solis         |
| Lampson        | Pascarell     | Souder        |
| Langevin       | Pastor        | Spence        |
| Lantos         | Payne         | Spratt        |
| Largent        | Pelosi        | Stark         |
| Larsen (WA)    | Pence         | Stearns       |
| Larson (CT)    | Peterson (MN) | Stenholm      |
| Latham         | Peterson (PA) | Strickland    |
| LaTourette     | Petri         | Stump         |
| Leach          | Phelps        | Stupak        |
| Lee            | Pickering     | Sunnunu       |
| Levin          | Pitts         | Sweeney       |
| Lewis (GA)     | Platts        | Tancred       |
| Lewis (KY)     | Pombo         | Tanner        |
| Linder         | Portman       | Tauscher      |
| Lipinski       | Price (NC)    | Tauzin        |
| LoBiondo       | Pryce (OH)    | Taylor (MS)   |
| Lofgren        | Putnam        | Taylor (NC)   |
| Lowey          | Quinn         | Terry         |
| Lucas (KY)     | Radanovich    | Thomas        |
| Lucas (OK)     | Rahall        | Thompson (CA) |
| Luther         | Ramstad       | Thompson (MS) |
| Maloney (CT)   | Rangel        | Thornberry    |
| Maloney (NY)   | Regula        | Thune         |
| Manzulio       | Rehberg       | Thurman       |
| Markey         | Reyes         | Tiahrt        |
| Mascara        | Reynolds      | Tiberi        |
| Matheson       | Riley         | Tierney       |
| Matsui         | Rivers        | Toomey        |
| McCarthy (MO)  | Rodriguez     | Towns         |
| McCarthy (NY)  | Roemer        | Trafficant    |
| McCollum       | Rogers (KY)   | Turner        |
| McCrery        | Rogers (MI)   | Udall (CO)    |
| McDermott      | Rohrabacher   | Udall (NM)    |
| McGovern       | Ros-Lehtinen  | Upton         |
| McInnis        | Ross          | Velazquez     |
| McIntyre       | Rothman       | Visclosky     |
| McKeon         | Roukema       | Vitter        |
| McKinney       | Roybal-Allard | Walden        |
| Meehan         | Royce         | Walsh         |
| Meek (FL)      | Rush          | Wamp          |
| Meeks (NY)     | Ryan (WI)     | Waters        |
| Menendez       | Ryun (KS)     | Watkins (OK)  |
| Mica           | Sabo          | Watt (NC)     |
| Millender-     | Sanchez       | Watts (OK)    |
| McDonald       | Sanders       | Waxman        |
| Miller (FL)    | Sandlin       | Weiner        |
| Miller, Gary   | Sawyer        | Weldon (FL)   |
| Miller, George | Saxton        | Weldon (PA)   |
| Mink           | Scarborough   | Weller        |
| Mollohan       | Schaffer      | Wexler        |
| Moore          | Schakowsky    | Whitfield     |
| Moran (KS)     | Schiff        | Wicker        |
| Moran (VA)     | Schrock       | Wilson        |
| Morella        | Scott         | Wolf          |
| Murtha         | Sessions      | Woolsey       |
| Myrick         | Shadegg       | Wu            |
| Nadler         | Shaw          | Wynn          |
| Napolitano     | Shays         | Young (AK)    |
| Neal           | Sherman       | Young (FL)    |

## NOT VOTING—9

|            |            |               |
|------------|------------|---------------|
| Berman     | Lewis (CA) | Pomeroy       |
| Dooley     | McHugh     | Sensenbrenner |
| Kilpatrick | Paul       | Watson (CA)   |

□ 1349

Mr. DINGELL and Mr. KIRK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 188

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 2356, it shall be in order to consider in the House S. 27. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2356 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 27 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 188 is a fair, structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 2356, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001. I would like to point out that this is not an unorthodox rule; rather, this rule is what is known as “regular order.”

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on

House Administration. The rule makes in order 20 amendments that were printed in the report accompanying the resolution. In addition to the full consideration of these amendments, the rule makes in order two substitutes, one offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), which is debatable for 30 minutes, and the other offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), which is debatable for 60 minutes.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, as well as all points of order against the amendments.

After passage of H.R. 2356, the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider in the House Senate 27. It waives all points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration.

The rule makes in order a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof provisions of H.R. 2356 as passed by the House. Furthermore, the rule waives all points of order against the motion to strike and insert. Additionally, the rule provides that if the motion to strike and insert is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin what is certain to be a very passionate debate, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, on his efforts to bring this issue before us today. The Speaker pledged a fair, open, and timely debate on this measure and, as has been the hallmark of his leadership, today has made good on that commitment. I would also like to acknowledge the great strides that have been made to ensure that this rule be made as fair as possible and to ensure a healthy debate on this important issue. As this rule was developed, the committee honored numerous requests from the gentleman from Connecticut to ensure a proper and complete debate. In short, we are here today because the Speaker has facilitated a fair and open process.

Additionally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for his fair bipartisan handling of this matter. The willingness of both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) to accommodate all parties involved by supporting alternative measures and open debate is a true testament to their leadership on this measure. I thank both the gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the unique opportunity to hear testimony on this issue from all sides, both as a member

of the Committee on House Administration and as a member of the Committee on Rules. I have witnessed firsthand the process that has brought us to this day, and I stand here before my colleagues proud of both the process and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, when we peel back the layers of debate on the issue before us today, when we remove the emotion and the hyperbole, when we separate the rhetoric from the reality, there is a fundamental question before this Congress today: how far will this Congress go in restricting the rights of the American people, whether individually or collectively, to participate in their political process? It is ironic that as this Congress and this country have achieved so much economically and socially by breaking down government regulation and intrusion, there are those who would have us impose excessive restrictions and undue burdens on the most basic of all human rights: the right of free speech. That we can improve our current campaign finance system is something upon which we can all agree, but to do so by destroying the very fabric of this Nation's political system is not an improvement, nor is it reform.

There are a number of important issues that we face in our shared desire to improve and reform campaign finance in these United States. Most important, we must ensure that we encourage rather than stifle citizen involvement in their political process.

The freedom to express one's views in the form of political speech is one of the inherent rights that this Nation was founded upon. Government restrictions which would limit that speech strike at the very core of our rights and liberties as Americans.

We should recognize, too, the freedom of political parties to encourage voter enrollment and participation. A vibrant party system has been and must continue to promote the free flow of ideas and debate that have shaped this Nation over the past 225 years.

By definition, Webster's dictionary says that "reform" means "to make or become better." What we do today must ensure that our campaign finance system does become better, and it can only become better if we recognize that curbing expensive campaigns should not come at the expense of political liberties. That is why I urge support of this rule and the support of the Ney-Wynn bill.

While neither the Shays-Meehan nor the Ney-Wynn bill bans so-called "soft money," Ney-Wynn at least ensures that such expenditures are used for party activities such as voter registration, getting out the vote, overhead, and fund-raising expenses. Such a provision will ensure that candidates cannot circumvent set limits, while ensuring a continued vibrant party system. Ney-Wynn also contains broader reporting requirements. People have a right to know who is supporting candidates for political office, and under

the Ney-Wynn bill they will have that information quickly and completely. Further, Ney-Wynn does more to restrict the influences of special interest groups.

□ 1400

Political parties will be restricted from fund-raising and spending soft money while special interests would still be allowed to spend funds in virtually unlimited amounts, increasing, rather than curtailing, their influence over the electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solid reason why the Ney-Wynn bill has enjoyed a growing bipartisan support over these past few weeks. That is because it is better, more responsible legislation that, as Webster defines, reforms our campaign finance system by making it better.

Mr. Speaker, let me once again remind my colleagues that our business here today is being conducted under regular order. This fair, standard rule is before this body because of the tireless efforts of both the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY).

Let us proceed with open debate on both the bill and its amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has brought us a rule that is the height of cynical political maneuvering, and the rule itself is, quite frankly, one of the most stupid proposals I have seen in my 23 years in this institution.

I want to look at the cynical maneuvering, first. We all know that the Republican leadership wants to defeat Shays-Meehan. There are, of course, Democrats who have some reservations about Shays-Meehan also, but these Democrats also believe in fundamental fairness, and that Shays-Meehan should have a clean, legitimate shot on the floor.

The Republican leadership has written a rule that everyone knows may well lose. If we assume that this rule is about cynicism, then what the Republican leadership has done is to present a rule to the House that they know will fail, and then they will refuse to reconvene the Committee on Rules to draft another rule.

They will refuse to schedule campaign finance reform for debate and simply explain it away by saying campaign finance reform is dead because the House refused to pass a rule to bring it up. This is, of course, the equivalent of killing your parents and then throwing yourself on the mercy of the court because you are an orphan.

Why do I say that this rule is likely to lose? Experience. It is a repeat of a rule that the then Democratic leadership fashioned in 1981 during the debate on the first Reagan budget. In 1981, the Democratic leadership refused to give

the Republican alternative, the now infamous Gramm-Latta substitute, a straight up-or-down vote. Rather, the Democratic leadership broke Gramm-Latta into pieces, requiring a series of votes on its provisions, thinking that that was the way to kill it.

Well, surprise, that rule was rejected by the House. Let me repeat, the House rejected that rule as fundamentally unfair to the minority. Now, 20 years later, the Republican leadership has constructed a rule that divides Shays-Meehan into 13 separate amendments.

Sound familiar? Maybe not, because no one in the current Republican leadership was in Congress in 1981. But I find it hard to believe they and their staff can be totally ignorant of history, and that they all have to know that there is a very good chance this rule will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, one might have to conclude that this is a cynical way to go about achieving their real objective, which is, of course, to kill Shays-Meehan.

Let us look at how incredibly dumb this rule is. It seems to have been written in such a way as to help the strategic objective of killing Shays-Meehan. I would suggest the way this rule is written that it might have the exact opposite effect.

There are a number of Members on both sides of the aisle who have legitimate and sincere concerns about Shays-Meehan. In the event this rule actually passes, the heavy-handed and cynical maneuvering on the part of the Republican leadership may well drive some of the opponents of Shays-Meehan right into the Shays-Meehan camp.

If that is the case, then the Republican leadership will have orchestrated their own defeat, the proverbial snatching of defeat from the jaws of victory.

There are legitimate issues involved in a discussion of the merits of the two main alternatives, Shays-Meehan and Ney-Wynn. I, for one, am concerned that the absolute prohibition in Shays-Meehan on the right of Members of Congress to raise non-Federal funds for State and local political parties to conduct voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities will weaken the political process and neuter Members of Congress. Members will not be able to play a meaningful role in voter turnout efforts in their home districts, and will become largely irrelevant to their own political parties.

The Ney-Wynn bill does not contain this provision, and it is important for Members to think very carefully about this issue if we get to the point where we might actually vote on the legislation.

However, because of this incredibly dumb rule and the cynical maneuvering on the part of the Republican leadership, we may never get to that point. On the other hand, if this rule is, by some chance, passed, the debate on this issue will be in such a highly charged atmosphere that it may well

be impossible to have a rational discussion on the fundamental issues involved. This will be a sad day for the democratic process in this institution and in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be defeated. The Republican leadership needs to be shamed into bringing back a new rule that is fair to the House, fair to the proponents of both bills, and fair to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been in Congress for 22 years, like the gentleman from Texas, but I do know the difference between right and wrong. I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) knows the difference between right and wrong.

What we recognize about this rule is that this is an honest up-or-down vote. Yesterday in the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) asked for his bill, and got what he asked for. He received it. That was his bill. We did not gut the bill. We are not putting any amendments against the bill. He gets his bill exactly the way that he said in the Committee on Rules he wanted it. He gets all 12 or 13 amendments.

Where I come from in Texas, you vote for what you are for and you vote against what you do not like. The fact of the matter is that this is an honest attempt to give our colleague, who is a Republican, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), exactly what he asked for in the Committee on Rules.

We are not hiding anything. We are not making it more difficult. We are simply giving him exactly what he wanted. I have lots of legislation on which I would love to have the same opportunity that we are extending to our colleague.

The fact of the matter is that in the Committee on Rules, it was the Democrats who sit on the Committee on Rules that did the beating up of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), that did the beating up of Shays-Meehan. They said that it had virtually no reason to be on the floor of the House of Representatives. It has no reason to take the time that we are spending on it.

The Republican leadership, not only the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. ARMEY and Mr. DELAY, but also our committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), have taken the time to schedule this vote to give the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) exactly what he asked for yesterday, and to make sure we have a full debate. I think it is not only fair and honest, but it is the right thing to do for our colleagues.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

I am the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration. As such, I participated in the markup of these two pieces of legislation, the Shays-Meehan legislation, which has in the past had 252 votes each time it was offered for passage on the floor of this House, and the Ney-Wynn bill, which is a new bill.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). At the markup, which was held on June 28, it was my understanding, and I believe the understanding of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) would have the opportunity, between June 28 and yesterday, to perfect their legislation, to present that perfected legislation to the Committee on Rules, and to have those pieces of legislation presented to the floor for consideration with such further amendments as others might have.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that was our understanding. I tell my friend, the gentleman from Texas, as a result, I did not offer any amendment. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) nor any other Member offered any amendments. Why? Because it was the understanding of all 10 of us, in my opinion, that the bills would be perfected in the 10 days between June 28 and July 8 or 9 or 10.

That was not done. What the gentleman suggests is a fair process is to divide up into 14 different sections the perfections of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) sought, and therefore try to fight each one of those 14 different times.

I frankly think that is not fair. Why is it not fair? Because, as the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, has put forward, it is a rule which does not comport with what the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) want to offer as their base bill.

Mr. Speaker, on the substance of this, the American public in my opinion is very concerned about the amount of money in politics. Rightly or wrongly, and I cast aspersions on no one in this House, rightly or wrongly, the American public believes that the gargantuan amounts of money that flow into Washington, into State Capitals, into local county seats as political contributions, hard or soft money, and that is a somewhat esoteric distinction that the public does not make, but it is an important one, because one is limited and one is not, they believe this is an important issue. They want to see it considered on its merits, not by procedural dissection, which is essentially what has occurred here.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a little bit of blurry history or rewriting history. I certainly was not here in 1981, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) was not, either. But as I recall, there was a minority substitute to a majority bill that the rule affected that the leadership lost, and the minority had a victorious day. In those days, the Republicans were the minority.

But when we look at today, I have been here today in both the Committee on House Administration and on the Committee on Rules. It was my understanding that on Wednesday evening, at the insistence of the sponsor of Shays-Meehan that we hold a markup before the July district work period, that was scheduled for Thursday before we left.

On Wednesday at 8 p.m. it was agreed upon by both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), who had to produce his bill, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) that he would produce his bill, and at 8 o'clock we would have the bill so the House, the entire House, 435 Members, would have the opportunity to learn what was in both bills.

That was because the Shays-Meehan bill that I knew as a State legislator watching the debate of this great body is now so much different than it was back then.

I am a fan of the 1957 T-Bird. It changed so much in the sixties, when I owned a sixties T-Bird, and in the seventies, in the eighties, and in the nineties, so the T-Bird today that is made reference to no longer looks like the 1957 Thunderbird. So you would have to be clarifying exactly what year of Thunderbirds you were referring to if you were an admirer.

In Shays-Meehan, this bill before us today is nothing like the Shays-Meehan bill that was constructed years ago and has been debated in this House in previous years. It is substantially different.

On the Committee on Rules, I have the opportunity to see managers' technical amendments on a frequent occasion. This bill, when we look at what happened with the Committee on Rules, we granted every single request, 12, of the Shays-Meehan bill. Whether they were technical or they were absolute critical changes that were made in the bill that would not be classified a manager's amendment, we gave it to the Shays-Meehan request.

Just as the Speaker said today, this week, we will have the debate on Shays-Meehan and any other amendments on campaign finance reform. It is here today. So the bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) reported by the Committee on House Administration will be debated in its entirety. As a matter of fact, they filed after the deadline, 4½ hours late, these 12 amendments, which were actually put

in the rule so they could be debated today in its entirety.

However, when we begin to look at special privileges for any Members, that becomes a political concept of what the Committee on Rules is, in fairness. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is not the manager of the campaign finance bill, it is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the Chair of the Committee on House Administration.

The en bloc amendment has been inaccurately referred to as the manager's amendment. The fact is that the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) is the manager of this legislation, so the amendment requested by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is not a manager's amendment.

Anyway, whether one is a freshman, a sophomore, as I, or a junior member of the Committee on Rules on the majority side, as its most senior Members know, an en bloc amendment has been inaccurately referred to as a manager's amendment in this legislation, and that an amendment en bloc is a clustering of individual amendments.

Mr. Speaker, each and every amendment requested by Shays-Meehan is in this rule, to be debated openly and fairly in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), from the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Committee on Rules is never done. We work hard and we work late into the evening trying to fine-tune some of the most controversial issues that this House ever faces.

□ 1415

And, indeed, that is exactly what we did last night.

My friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), came to our committee and he made his presentation; and he was passionate, as he always is, because he believes in this. And to a large extent, I do as well. This has been his cause, and he has fought it very well.

So I am very surprised today by all the fanfare over this manager's amendment, because the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) did not even mention this manager's amendment in his presentation to the Committee on Rules until I brought it up. At that time he said, oh yes, and he explained it briefly, and left us on the committee with the distinct impression that as long as his provisions were included in some way, it was okay to divide it up. Indeed, his words were: "There are about 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 12 changes, one or two are technical, some are substantive, but this is an amendment that gets our bill in a form that we are most comfortable defending. And so, obviously, we like it. Some people have

said you might like to divide them up into pieces; however, you decide."

He told the Committee on Rules, you decide. And so we did. We felt that to divide this up and allow examination of these substantive changes was the right and fair thing to do. So for all of us who have worked so hard to get this bill here today, for everyone who has done so much, no matter where you stand on it, do not kill this rule. Today is the day. Have we not waited long enough?

There is nothing unfair about this rule. And if it is defeated, I hope that this country understands who defeated it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It will be very clear that it will be the Republican majority that defeats the rule, if it does go down.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this silly rule. This rule provides the American people with a limited opportunity to debate this important issue. It is a rule that was written by the Republican leadership that fears the will of the American people to have an open and honest debate on campaign finance reform.

If we are to maintain this institution's reputation as a representative body, then it is imperative that the American people have an opportunity to freely debate this issue here on the floor of the House. It appears the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) does not understand that when this bill is chopped up like it is, it will not have an up or a down vote, which I assure my colleagues, he is not in favor of.

Mr. Speaker, I have another problem with today's debate. I want to know why we are even talking about campaign finance reform before we are talking about election reform. I would think that after last year's travesty of an election, in which it was discovered that thousands of Americans nationwide had their right to vote stripped from them, Congress would have acted by now.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the rule as well as in strong support of the need for a paycheck protection provision to the campaign finance reform bill, and I will tell my colleagues why.

Banning soft money to the parties does not take the money out of politics, it only takes the money out of the parties. For example, currently a union such as the AFL-CIO can give \$1 million to the Democratic party. The Democratic party will then turn around and run attack ads against Republicans like me that say, "Call Rick Keller and ask him why he is a bad

guy." Well, if we ban the soft money to the party, we will still see the exact same TV attack ad on the air. The only difference will be the little disclaimer at the bottom of the screen which will now say, "Paid for by AFL-CIO," as opposed to, "Paid for by the Democratic party."

Any attempts to ban these ads 60 days before an election is blatantly unconstitutional. That is why to be fair and balanced we must also couple the ban on soft money with a paycheck protection requirement that requires unions to get the written consent of their workers if they intend to use part of their union dues for political activities. This is critical because fully 40 percent of the union members nationwide are Republicans, yet nearly all of their \$100 million per election year is spent by unions on behalf of liberal Democrats. This is blatantly unfair and one-sided.

But I ask my colleagues not to take my word for it. Listen to what Thomas Jefferson, our third President and the author of the Declaration of Independence, had to say about this matter. In 1779, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." Yet the American worker is forced to do just that.

Finally, President Bush has repeatedly said that paycheck protection is an important component to any campaign finance reform bill. We should give the President a fair and balanced campaign finance reform bill that he can sign into law.

I support the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today we have a historic opportunity to enact meaningful campaign finance reform. The Senate completed its work and passed a bill. The bipartisan Shays-Meehan measure has been twice passed by this House in previous Congresses.

We are on the threshold of bringing real reform to a system that is out of control and overrun by big-monied interest. Yet here we are debating the merits of a procedural rule that can only be characterized as guaranteed to fail. It does not allow the Shays-Meehan bill to be considered as a coherent whole. It is disingenuous and unfair.

This rule allows for 22 amendments designed to eviscerate the Shays-Meehan legislation; designed to kill the bill. Until we can get a clean up or down vote, we might as well tack up a "for sale" sign on all of our office doors.

We need to question the overall strategy behind this rule. If Shays-Meehan does not get defeated on the floor, then the opponents have paved the way for it to die in conference with the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support genuine reform; that they not be afraid of real action. Restore integrity to our



political process, restore America's faith in its political process. Defeat this rule. Support a clean vote on campaign finance reform.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have the unofficial comments made by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), last night in the Committee on Rules, which I would like to just share with the House as we look at the rule, the debate of the rule, with the balance of the time we have left.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said: "I just want people to have a fair and open debate on this process. Even if it disadvantage us if we have 200 amendments to go after our bill, I have always believed that the debate is healthy. I have always taken the position that we could be the substitute or the base bill, as long as ultimately you amend whatever is the base bill.

"Obviously, if you take up the Ney bill and he takes us down, we lost. And then you amend the Ney bill. If we survive, then we amend our bill. I have always taken that basic view.

"A vote for the Ney bill is a vote against our bill. And if he is the base bill and we replace him, then we amend our bill. I have always made that assumption.

"This manager's amendment, as I referred to it, I reluctantly call it the manager's amendment, it sounds ostentatious. I am not sure I feel like a manager. But this is an amendment that gets our bill in a form that we are most comfortable defending. And so obviously we like it. Some people have said you might like to divide them up into pieces; however, you decide."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is not really about technicalities, though there is a manager's amendment that we should have been able to offer and, in fact, we will be able to offer, because this rule is going down if we do not get an up or down vote on campaign finance reform.

But what this really is about are technicalities designed to kill a bill to end this soft money abuse. The United States Senate, in a historic vote, voted for a bill we have been working to preconference with Members of the other body. We have negotiated over a period of time and had a final product at 12 o'clock midnight on Tuesday. The Committee on Rules did not meet until Wednesday, sometime around 3 o'clock. We should have had the opportunity to present to the committee and have an up or down vote on the bill that we agreed to. But technicalities were being used to try to defeat campaign finance reform.

There is a strong feel across America these unlimited amounts of money have to be curtailed. We cannot get a

patient's bill of rights passed in this body because of the influence of soft money. We cannot get Medicare prescription drug coverage for seniors because \$15.7 million in soft money are gumming up the works. It becomes difficult to get legislation passed to protect our environment when continually soft money has played a role in killing that legislation.

So my colleagues can talk all the technicalities that they want. The fact of the matter is, my colleagues will either give us an en bloc amendment or we will defeat the rule. Because the American people want a vote on Shays-Meehan, and they want that bill to be similar enough to the bill passed in the other body so that we can avoid a conference committee, where legislation to reform our campaign finance laws have historically died, where the Patient's Bill of Rights died, where reasonable gun safety measures to protect America's children have died.

We want to avoid that conference committee. So we have preconferenced this bill in an effort to build on the progress that was made in the other body, in an effort to work with Members in a bipartisan way in this body, Republican Members who are willing to take on this issue in a leadership role and a bulk of the Democrat party, to see to it we end this abuse of the soft money system. It is inexcusable to continue to fund political campaigns through unlimited amounts of money.

I believe tonight, as soon as my colleagues acquiesce on this rule, we will be ready to begin that historic debate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment that I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), addressed the group in the House today, because he was not at the Committee on Rules to present his case before us as we deliberated over the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very difficult couple of days. I have been working with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on this matter for some time. Some time ago the gentleman from Connecticut, speaking on behalf of himself and his cosponsors, came to me and requested that they be given a fair shake on this, that they get a chance to have their bill heard and have it heard in a timely fashion. We have worked on that. Today is the time that the gentleman from Connecticut and others have agreed to.

The gentleman from Connecticut came to me and said, I do not want anybody stacking the rule against me, I want to make sure it is a fair competition between my bill, which over 2 weeks ago he informed me was written. In fact, the gentleman came to me and

exercised his frustration and impatience that the bill that the committee would put up was not yet written when his was already written and ready to go, and would I protect his bill so that he could have a straight up and down bill, as his bill was, and was written and was ready to go at least 2 weeks ago. We assured him that that would happen.

He subsequently came back and said I want my bill as a base bill, not the committee mark. I do not want the conventional thing here, which is to put the committee's mark on as the base bill and have mine as a substitute. I want mine as the base bill, and let the committee's be a substitute. We agreed. We wanted to be fair. We gave him that special consideration. So his bill is the base bill.

And, now, in the last few days, he has come before us and he said I want to amend my bill, and I have a demand that I have my amendment in the way I would like it. And he said, I have 14 different things I would like to do with this bill; 14 different amendments to this bill. Six of the 14 are provisions to strike all together provisions in his bill that was ready to go 2 weeks ago. Six provisions to strike.

Now, what does he want to strike? What are those provisions? I think we ought to talk about it. Three of those were to clarify provisions that he had in his bill, that was ready to go 2 weeks ago. Let us go with it. But now we need time, in this 11th hour, to clarify. What are those three clarifications? What do they mean?

□ 1430

I think we ought to know about that. Here is one, for example. What does this mean? It says he has one amendment that would increase the aggregate limit on individual contributions to \$95,000 per cycle, including not more than \$37,500 per cycle to candidates, and reserving \$20,000 per cycle for the national party committees.

Is that soft money, or is that hard money? What individuals are we talking about? I think we ought to talk about that amendment.

Our complaint is that I do not get these 14 amendments. Incidentally, I might mention, Mr. Speaker, 145 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules accepted 20 amendments. Fourteen of the 20 amendments that were accepted were amendments of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS). Here is a fellow who has gotten his bill that just 2 weeks ago was ready to go as the base bill, and now he needs 14 amendments to his own bill.

When was the last time we saw anybody in this House come to the House with their bill and need 14 amendments to their own bill, 14 separate amendments to their bill? Also, if I do not get them, I am not being treated fair.

I am a little concerned about that concept of fairness. Fourteen of the 20 were given to the author of the bill



himself, to amend his own bill, that just 2 weeks ago was ready to go, 14 substantive amendments.

What we have is a person who got the bill on the floor when he wanted it on the floor, got the bill that he wrote that was ready to go as the base bill ahead of consideration of the committee's bill, who has been given the opportunity to have 14 out of the 20 amendments made available to amend his own bill on the floor, who is now complaining that we are not being fair with this Committee on Rules.

What more could the Rules Committee have done? Who else got that much consideration on any bill at any time? It is not fair.

Then further, not being satisfied to just complain that the Committee on Rules is an unfair committee of our colleagues, we have an attack on the Speaker himself from the New York Times, not a disinterested party.

The New York Times that knows very well their institutional influence over elections will be enhanced by the Shays-Meehan version of the bill more so than the committee mark. The New York Times says the Speaker balkanizes a bill he opposes against the sponsors' wishes, and he calls it an arrogant abuse of power.

The Speaker has put the bill that was ready to go 2 weeks ago through the Rules Committee on the floor as a base bill. The Speaker has said we are going to allow 20 people to offer 20 amendments to that bill in a timely, orderly fashion. Fourteen of the 20 amendments are given to the author of the bill himself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me spare myself this embarrassment. I pledge to you right now, should at any time ever in the future of my service in the Congress of the United States I have the honor and the privilege of having the Committee on Rules make my bill in order as the base bill, ahead of the committee's bill, I will not embarrass myself by asking for 16 amendments to rewrite my bill, and further insist that the 16 amendments be made together as one lump-sum amendment not to be examined, not to be dissected, not to be understood, not to be debated, but just an ad hoc rewrite at the moment on the floor.

I will try to the very best of my ability, when I say my bill is ready to go, to be satisfied, to have my bill ready to go and not need to amend it with 16 amendments.

To further save myself the embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, let me pledge right now that should at any time ever in the future of my life as a legislator I have a Committee on Rules that is generous enough to give me, out of 145 requests, 14 of the 20 requests that are honored as amendments to my own bill, I will save myself the indignity of protesting the unfairness of it all.

Let me say to the New York Times, give me a break. What more do they want in the name of fairness?

Here is the deal. We have those people who had a bill passed in the Senate,

who have decided that their bill does not need to be subjected to a normal legislative process, which is to be conferred with a similar bill from the House, that which happens with virtually every piece of legislation ever legislated in the history of this body, a normal conference process, that believes that they will be cheated if they do not get their exact Senate bill passed in the House.

That is unreasonable, uninformed and arrogant. To say that I am being subjected to unfairness when I am asked to go through a normal legislative process is arrogant.

Mr. Speaker, this Committee on Rules is a decent, honorable committee. They have been fair and just. They have been considerate. The Speaker is a decent, honorable man, who has bent over backwards to be generous to the advocates of the Shays-Meehan bill. He does not deserve this kind of diatribe. I regret there are people in our body who are so small.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that the gentleman from Texas, speaking on behalf of the Speaker, is in support of Shays-Meehan; or is the gentleman against Shays-Meehan?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of responsible campaign finance reform that does respect the first amendment rights of the American people and does not trespass against freedom of speech; and I am not confident that Shays-Meehan is done as well as the committee mark. But on the debate of the rule, do not tell me that I am being treated unfairly when I have been given 14 separate opportunities to amend my own bill. That is unreasonable. That is arrogant.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today we have an extremely important vote for this body, a vote that counts instead of a vote that can be passed off and characterized as it does not make a difference.

Today papers all across the country screamed that the Republican Party raises record amounts of money, and the Democratic Party raises record amounts of money. All this big money hurts the little person. It hurts the little person's voice to be able to participate in this election process.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would defeat this rule as written because this rule not only dissects and bisects the Shays-Meehan language that should have been a manager's amendment to perfect this bill, but it is an unfair rule. Republicans and Democrats should bring this rule down so we can get legitimate debate on the other matters.

Mr. Speaker, the House centrist coalition of five Democrats and five Republicans strongly supports Shays-Meehan; I hope we vote for that bill at the end of the day.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about campaign finance reform, this is our one chance. Some of the party leaders in both parties do not want reform, and I think we have seen examples of it during this debate. They do not want reform. They would be delighted for us to turn down the rule. That is exactly what they are waiting for.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a longtime helper with Shays-Meehan, and the money providers who work for each party is what some of these party people are simply working on.

Vote for the rule. It is the one chance we have to make real reform happen. Those who do not vote for this rule will play right into the hands of those who want no reform. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this rule. In fact, it amazes me that we would even consider such a convoluted attempt to sabotage true campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that has an 83 to 85 percent voter turnout. So my colleagues know that the people I work for care very much about our Nation. They care about our Constitution, and they care about the campaign process.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and people all over this Nation want campaign finance reform like the Shays-Meehan bill that will take big money out of the process. And like all people, they want young people in particular to feel that they belong to the process, that they want to be involved, that they are proud to be voters, that they are proud to be part of the democratic process.

The people I represent in Marin and Sonoma Counties know that our democracy depends on getting everybody involved in our electoral system. We must defeat this bill so we can start over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House in a special election 3 years ago, my first official act after being sworn in was to sign on to the Shays-Meehan bill. It was one of the proudest moments of my career. Today is one of the darkest days I have ever experienced in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, passed in the dead of night, is unfair. It is undemocratic. It is a cynical parliamentary ploy aimed at stopping a straight up-or-down vote on the Shays-Meehan bill as a whole.

The American people will not stand for this. They want to see democracy restored. They want us to reform a campaign finance system that is awash in unregulated soft money and dominated by special interests.

Mr. Speaker, let us defeat this rule and have a fair and honest debate on the merits of the Shays-Meehan bill. By defeating the rule we can reassure all Americans that our cherished democracy is not for sale.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, rarely are there times that one vote can fundamentally turn the tide of political history. I think today is such a moment. Our generation of political leadership can shape a new future, a future which will be free from the influence of unregulated and unlimited contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we must make it a relic of the past where every issue we consider and every issue we ignore, from health care reform to energy policy, is determined by the clout of one special interest or another, and where the Congress has become more a marionette than a Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that less than half of the people of our Nation turn out on election days? Weak substitutes allowing soft money and third-party advertising to continue will only foster a disconnect between the people and those who represent them.

I do not like the push to raise the limits for hard dollars because I think this debate is about limiting the influence of money and politics and not increasing it. But this issue is larger than what my concerns are. We should go back to what our Founders both dreamed about and built when they founded the greatest democracy in the history of the world. We should reform the system. We should defeat this rule, and we should adopt real, meaningful campaign finance reform.

□ 1445

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up there was a kid on my street that was not very good at any games we played. He was so bad that he would oftentimes not get a chance to play after his team would lose. But because he owned the football and the basketball that we had, or we played with, he oftentimes got a chance to play. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is laughing. He may know what I am talking about a little bit. It seems to me we have reached a point here in the Congress where there

are some players on the other side of the aisle who simply are not as good as some of the players on this side of the aisle.

In this instance, we have a bill called Shays-Meehan, which is superior to theirs. So my friend, the distinguished majority leader, has come to the floor and suggested to us all that the way in which we are proceeding with this legislation, the way in which my friends, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), went before the committee somehow or another surprised him.

This is the same United States Congress that kept us here until 4 in the morning to vote on a \$1.3 trillion budget, in the wee hours of the morning; the same United States Congress that kept us here until 7 in the morning to vote on a budget. Shame on you, Mr. Leader. Thank you, New York Times.

We ought to be thankful that Shays-Meehan will eventually get an up or down vote and will eventually ban soft money. Mr. Leader, bring the ball back. Let the rest of us play. You have a bad bill, but America wants meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, every person in this body takes an oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic. There is no greater enemy to our Constitution, indeed to our democracy, than the role of money in the political process today. Those of us who take this oath of office to serve in Congress serve in Washington, D.C., a city that was built on a swamp. Two centuries later, it is back to being a swamp, a political swamp.

Today, we have the opportunity to drain the swamp and change the political landscape of political fund-raising in our country. We have an opportunity to empower the people. How many people have been turned off by the political process because of the role of big money? How many people fear that the Speaker's gavel is an auctioneer's gavel, not the gavel of the people? How many people decide not to run for office because of the role money plays?

Today, we have an opportunity to send a message to the American people that their role in the political process is important, in supporting candidates or in being candidates. We have an opportunity to clean up our act. And indeed we have a responsibility to do so. I have great confidence that if we pass the Shays-Meehan bill and when we pass the Shays-Meehan bill, we will clear the way for a new way in America in terms of political involvement. We have the creativity, we have the experience, we have the issues, we have the interest on the part of the American people which will be reawakened to involve them more fully in a government

of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this historic opportunity and support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time. My applause is to Shays-Meehan and to Ney and Wynn for engaging us in a debate that should be worthy of what the Founding Fathers thought that America was all about, democracy. But I will say to my dear and distinguished colleague, I am embarrassed. I am embarrassed that we would take the Shays-Meehan legislative initiative as we would take any other and totally implode it so that a reasonable debate could not be had up or down on this legislative initiative.

I am reminded of the telling of such an act some years ago when we were in the majority and we decided to play politics with a budget bill. It was wrong and we lost on the rule. So I stand here today saying, I am disappointed that the amendments that I had that dealt with the empowerment, ensuring that ethnic and racial minorities would be empowered to do voter registration and outreach were denied. But I am more embarrassed and I am outraged that we would not give the Shays-Meehan legislation an up or down vote and we would decide to give us this long list of fingers, so confusion will abound and the Founding Fathers' belief in democracy will be extinguished.

We need to defeat this rule so that we can have a fair and democratic process to debate this like our Founding Fathers and I know our Mothers would have wanted us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

The purpose of campaign finance reform is to make federal election financing fair and balanced for all candidates. This is something we all agree with, regardless of party. I find it extremely troubling that the Rules Committee would report out a structured rule designed to limit and confuse meaningful debate on H.R. 2356, the "Bipartisan Campaign Finance Act of 2001."

Mr. Speaker, this rule is simply not in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation. Campaign Finance reform is an important issue for the future health of our country. Every person in America will be affected by the debate we hold today. It is a travesty of good government to prohibit an up or down vote on this piece of legislation. By limiting debate on H.R. 2356 to a technical discussion of individual portions of the bill, the Rules Committee has made it virtually impossible for this body to do justice to the magnitude of the decision we make here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disappointed in the committee's decision to offer a narrow slate of poison pill amendments for debate. I offered three debates in the spirit of inclusion and good government. The first might have helped this legislation to avoid a constitutional challenge by allowing constituent groups the right

to speak with their elected leaders. The second might have allowed for more detailed information on campaign finance reform by tracking its effect on all communities in the United States. The third would have committed this body toward fair and equal participation for all in elections. Rather than consider these proposals, the leadership has stifled considerable debate by reporting a rule designed to push their agenda through without regard to the will of the American people once again.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has reached a crucial point in its history. We could have discussed meaningful amendments that would protect the voices of all Americans. The Rules Committee should have paid attention to both the ancient and recent history of this Nation. Equal access to the right to vote has been a constant struggle within the United States, and until we take seriously the right of every citizen to participate in the political process by developing a campaign finance structure that promotes election reform for all Americans, this country will suffer.

I am disappointed. The American people will be, too. I oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about an issue that over 250 Members of this House have voted for twice and passed in the past. A similar bill has already passed the Senate in April. The leadership of this House promised supporters of campaign finance reform a straight up or down vote on Shays-Meehan, a bill so similar to the Senate version that a conference committee was not required, and we know that the conference committee has been the graveyard for campaign finance reform. I guess the leadership felt they could not win on the merits, so they had to manipulate the process to shortchange the American people once again.

Let us show the American people that our government is not for sale. Let us show the American people that we support elections, not auctions to the highest spender. Let us vote against this undemocratic rule. Let us bring it down so that we can bring Shays-Meehan to the floor for an up or down vote and send it to the Senate so a conference committee is not required, the President can sign it, and we can finally pass meaningful reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this rule, and I raise my voice in support of a straight up or down vote on Shays-Meehan.

The Supreme Court of the United States has laid out very clearly for all of us the role that Congress can play in regulating elections in this country. They have told us that Congress can prohibit the use of corporate treasury funds and union dues money in Federal elections. They have told us that we may limit contributions to candidates, parties and political committees; that we may pass laws to combat actual

corruption and the appearance of corruption in the operation of the Federal Government; that we can require disclosure of the source and size of certain kinds of spending and most contributions; and that we can regulate coordinated expenditures to thwart attempts to circumvent existing election law. That is what the Supreme Court has already said.

Shays-Meehan does no more than what the Supreme Court has already endorsed, and it does no more than what is right. I urge Members to vote against this rule and support Shays-Meehan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the rule, a rule that in effect takes Shays-Meehan and cuts it into 14 little pieces, a rule that says to the supporters of Shays-Meehan, If you are willing to vote for it once, we are going to put you to the test of voting for it 14 times.

Why is this being offered over the opposition of both Shays and Meehan? Very simply for this reason, the opposition believes they cannot defeat Shays-Meehan in an up or down vote. The only way they can defeat this legislation is if they can obfuscate; if they can make it ambiguous, unclear; if they can conceal to the American people whether they are really for it or against it.

The American people not only have the right to an up or down vote to end soft money and its corrupting influence on the political process, they have the right to the accountability that comes with a clear and unequivocal vote up or down on campaign finance reform. That is what is being denied with this rule. That is why we must reject this rule, so that the American people can have a clear and unequivocal vote for or against campaign finance reform.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, I stand in opposition to this rule. As a second-term Member of Congress, legislation was quite new to me in my first term. What I am seeing happening today is the inability of a legislator with good intention to offer a campaign finance reform bill who, after having had a chance to speak with his or her colleagues, saying, Well, maybe that's a good idea. Maybe I should suggest an amendment or a change. Yes, there are 14. There probably could be 25 amendments that would be offered by colleagues to try and make this a better bill.

I must say very truthfully, I am still torn about how we do campaign finance reform. I support campaign finance reform because I know it is good for all

the people of our country. How we get to it seems to be a difficult question. And I say to Mr. Leader and to others here on the floor, let us take some time. The Senate dedicated 2 weeks. Why do we only get 1 day?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This is kind of an extraordinary situation we now find ourselves in on the floor. I would like to reiterate something I said at the beginning of this debate. This is a very peculiar result. The Republican leadership has crafted such an unfair and unusual rule that it may have the exact opposite effect of what the Republican leadership intended. They are trying to defeat Shays-Meehan, but they have written such a terrible rule that they may in fact drive some of the opponents of Shays-Meehan into the Shays-Meehan camp. It is a very interesting result.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can still have a rule today that is fair and seen as fair by Members on both sides of the aisle. This issue is a bipartisan issue. It is an issue on which we have always had bipartisan support. What we are saying today is that a vote for the rule as it presently reads is a vote against real campaign reform. I know there is disagreement on that, but all we are really saying is that we would like and appreciate what we believe is a fair procedure. And to us that means allowing us to have a manager's amendment putting all of the changes that we want to make in our bill in order with one vote. We then are happy to face any amendments that anyone wants to, in an orderly way, make against this bill and then vote on the Ney bill and then vote, if that does not succeed, on the Shays-Meehan bill.

This is an important moment in our democracy. There are many of us who feel deeply that this system is flawed, that there is too much money involved in campaigns, that the American people have become cynical about politics and about our democracy, and we have to be able to at least have an effort to pass real, meaningful campaign reform now, today, or at the latest tomorrow or next week.

I ask the leadership in all sincerity to give us what we believed was a fair procedure, for us to be able to get our bill perfected and in front of the Congress, take any shots with any amendments that are desired and then give us a vote on Ney and a vote on Shays-Meehan.

I will just finally say again, this is a big moment for our country. A lot of people out there are watching. There are a lot of people out there, just ordinary citizens, who want there to be less special interests involved in the political process. They want the Government and the democracy returned to

them. They want to know that their small contributions of participation and checks into this system count as much as the \$50,000 and the \$100,000 and the \$500,000 checks.

□ 1500

I pray that we can come out of this House of Representatives today with real reform.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. What could be more fair, Mr. Speaker, than to allow all the changes that Members have requested to be debated and voted in the daylight of public scrutiny on this floor. We are all here because we believe that righteousness exalts a nation, but let us craft a system today that exalts the righteous, brings down the corrupt but does not sacrifice the blood-bought liberties, the freedom of speech of all Americans.

I strongly support the rule and I urge its passage.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the rule be extended for 20 minutes, equal time between the majority and the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask if the gentleman could please restate his unanimous consent request.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the rule be extended 20 minutes, and for equal time between the majority and the minority.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, I would ask the gentleman why he is making this request. This is a very unusual request. I have been in the House for 23 years. I do not recall the time being extended on a rule at any time during the 23 years that I have served in the House of Representatives.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I am a new guy in the House. I think that some of my colleagues have expressed that they would spend some time expressing their view on the rule. I think some of my colleagues are seeing some different dimensions on the rule in discussions with some of the colleagues after hearing some of the debate on the rule, and I am one of those that believes that before we conclude our business tonight we are going to have a full and open debate on campaign finance reform.

I think my colleagues are expressing in the debate of the rule the opportunity of how we will continue having an open, fair debate on campaign finance reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I would ask a question, if I may, and I see that the chairman of the Committee on Rules is on his feet. I would ask the chairman, is it the intention of the majority side to seek a change in the rule at this point to amend the rule at this point?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say it is obvious that we very much, in a bipartisan way, want to move ahead with campaign finance reform. My friend and I discussed this late last night in the Committee on Rules, and we fashioned a rule and it is quite possible that we could, as we have discussed with the side of the gentleman, propose a modification to the rule. As we work on that unanimous consent request which has just been propounded by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), it is so that we might continue an interesting discussion on the issue of campaign finance reform and, during that time, ensure that we have a package put into place that will allow us to proceed with a full and fair and vigorous debate throughout the rest of the afternoon and evening.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman, is this discussion about changes in the rule only occurring on his side of the aisle or are there any Members on our side of the aisle who are being consulted about potential changes in the rule?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I will say that I know that there are consultations that have gone on in a bipartisan way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think there are conversations going on everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) under his reservation of objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move for a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

Mr. HOYER. I do not believe the gentleman had the floor. He did not have the floor.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I had the floor. I do not believe the other gentleman is recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) withdraw his unanimous consent request?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 227]

|             |               |                |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Davis, Jo Ann | Houghton       |
| Ackerman    | Davis, Tom    | Hoyer          |
| Aderholt    | Deal          | Hulshof        |
| Akin        | DeFazio       | Hyde           |
| Allen       | DeGette       | Inslee         |
| Andrews     | Delahunt      | Isakson        |
| Armey       | DeLauro       | Israel         |
| Baca        | DeLay         | Issa           |
| Bachus      | DeMint        | Istook         |
| Baird       | Deutsch       | Jackson (IL)   |
| Baker       | Diaz-Balart   | Jackson-Lee    |
| Baldacci    | Dicks         | (TX)           |
| Baldwin     | Dingell       | Jefferson      |
| Ballenger   | Doggett       | Jenkins        |
| Barcia      | Doolittle     | John           |
| Barr        | Doyle         | Johnson (CT)   |
| Barrett     | Dreier        | Johnson (IL)   |
| Bartlett    | Duncan        | Johnson, E. B. |
| Barton      | Dunn          | Johnson, Sam   |
| Bass        | Edwards       | Jones (NC)     |
| Becerra     | Ehlers        | Jones (OH)     |
| Bentsen     | Ehrlich       | Kanjorski      |
| Bereuter    | Emerson       | Kaptur         |
| Berkley     | Engel         | Keller         |
| Berman      | English       | Kelly          |
| Berry       | Eshoo         | Kennedy (MN)   |
| Biggert     | Etheridge     | Kennedy (RI)   |
| Bilirakis   | Evans         | Kerns          |
| Bishop      | Everett       | Kildee         |
| Blagojevich | Farr          | Kilpatrick     |
| Blumenauer  | Fattah        | Kind (WI)      |
| Blunt       | Ferguson      | King (NY)      |
| Boehlert    | Finler        | Kingston       |
| Boehner     | Flake         | Kirk           |
| Bonilla     | Fletcher      | Klecza         |
| Bonior      | Foley         | Knollenberg    |
| Bono        | Forbes        | Kolbe          |
| Borski      | Ford          | Kucinich       |
| Boswell     | Fossella      | LaFalce        |
| Boucher     | Frelinghuysen | LaHood         |
| Boyd        | Frost         | Lampson        |
| Brady (PA)  | Galleghy      | Langevin       |
| Brady (TX)  | Ganske        | Lantos         |
| Brown (FL)  | Gekas         | Largent        |
| Brown (OH)  | Gephardt      | Larsen (WA)    |
| Brown (SC)  | Gibbons       | Larson (CT)    |
| Bryant      | Gilchrest     | Latham         |
| Burr        | Gillmor       | LaTourette     |
| Burton      | Gilman        | Leach          |
| Buyer       | Gonzalez      | Lee            |
| Callahan    | Goode         | Levin          |
| Calvert     | Goodlatte     | Lewis (GA)     |
| Camp        | Gordon        | Lewis (KY)     |
| Cannon      | Goss          | Linder         |
| Cantor      | Graham        | Lipinski       |
| Capito      | Granger       | LoBiondo       |
| Capps       | Graves        | Loftgren       |
| Capuano     | Green (TX)    | Lowey          |
| Cardin      | Green (WI)    | Lucas (KY)     |
| Carson (IN) | Greenwood     | Lucas (OK)     |
| Carson (OK) | Grucci        | Luther         |
| Castle      | Gutierrez     | Maloney (CT)   |
| Chabot      | Gutknecht     | Maloney (NY)   |
| Chambliss   | Hall (OH)     | Markey         |
| Clay        | Hall (TX)     | Mascara        |
| Clayton     | Hansen        | Matheson       |
| Clement     | Harman        | Matsui         |
| Clyburn     | Hart          | McCarthy (MO)  |
| Coble       | Hastings (FL) | McCarthy (NY)  |
| Collins     | Hastings (WA) | McCollum       |
| Combest     | Hayes         | McCrery        |
| Condit      | Hayworth      | McDermott      |
| Conyers     | Hefley        | McGovern       |
| Cooksey     | Herger        | McHugh         |
| Costello    | Hill          | McInnis        |
| Cox         | Hilleary      | McIntyre       |
| Coyne       | Hilliard      | McKeon         |
| Cramer      | Hinchey       | McKinney       |
| Crane       | Hinojosa      | McNulty        |
| Crenshaw    | Hobson        | Meehan         |
| Crowley     | Hoeffel       | Meeks (NY)     |
| Cubin       | Hoekstra      | Menendez       |
| Culberson   | Holden        | Mica           |
| Cummings    | Holt          | Millender-     |
| Cunningham  | Honda         | McDonald       |
| Davis (CA)  | Hooley        | Miller (FL)    |
| Davis (FL)  | Horn          | Miller, Gary   |
| Davis (IL)  | Hostettler    | Miller, George |

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Mink          | Rodriguez     | Stupak        |
| Mollohan      | Roemer        | Sununu        |
| Moore         | Rogers (KY)   | Sweeney       |
| Moran (KS)    | Rogers (MI)   | Tancredo      |
| Moran (VA)    | Rohrabacher   | Tanner        |
| Morella       | Ros-Lehtinen  | Tauscher      |
| Murtha        | Ross          | Tauzin        |
| Myrick        | Rothman       | Taylor (MS)   |
| Nadler        | Roukema       | Taylor (NC)   |
| Napolitano    | Roybal-Allard | Terry         |
| Neal          | Royce         | Thomas        |
| Nethercutt    | Rush          | Thompson (CA) |
| Ney           | Ryan (WI)     | Thompson (MS) |
| Northup       | Ryun (KS)     | Thornberry    |
| Norwood       | Sabo          | Thune         |
| Nussle        | Sanchez       | Thurman       |
| Oberstar      | Sanders       | Tiahrt        |
| Obey          | Sandlin       | Tiberi        |
| Olver         | Sawyer        | Tierney       |
| Ortiz         | Saxton        | Toomey        |
| Osborne       | Scarborough   | Towns         |
| Ose           | Schaffer      | Trafigant     |
| Otter         | Schakowsky    | Turner        |
| Oxley         | Schiff        | Udall (CO)    |
| Pallone       | Schrock       | Udall (NM)    |
| Pascarell     | Scott         | Upton         |
| Pastor        | Sensenbrenner | Velazquez     |
| Payne         | Serrano       | Visclosky     |
| Pelosi        | Sessions      | Vitter        |
| Pence         | Shadegg       | Walden        |
| Peterson (MN) | Shaw          | Walsh         |
| Peterson (PA) | Shays         | Wamp          |
| Petri         | Sherman       | Waters        |
| Phelps        | Sherwood      | Watkins (OK)  |
| Pickering     | Shimkus       | Watson (CA)   |
| Pitts         | Shows         | Watt (NC)     |
| Platts        | Shuster       | Watts (OK)    |
| Pombo         | Simmons       | Waxman        |
| Pomeroy       | Simpson       | Weiner        |
| Portman       | Skeen         | Weldon (FL)   |
| Price (NC)    | Skelton       | Weldon (PA)   |
| Pryce (OH)    | Slaughter     | Weller        |
| Putnam        | Smith (MI)    | Wexler        |
| Quinn         | Smith (NJ)    | Whitfield     |
| Radanovich    | Smith (TX)    | Wicker        |
| Rahall        | Smith (WA)    | Wilson        |
| Ramstad       | Snyder        | Wolf          |
| Rangel        | Solis         | Woolsey       |
| Regula        | Souder        | Wu            |
| Rehberg       | Spratt        | Wynn          |
| Reyes         | Stearns       | Young (AK)    |
| Reynolds      | Stenholm      | Young (FL)    |
| Riley         | Strickland    |               |
| Rivers        | Stump         |               |

□ 1713

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). On this rollcall, 422 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 1 minute remaining on debate on the rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the time is here. We are going to have a vote on this rule. This is a fair rule. It allows for full debate on Shays-Meehan, along with the 14 changes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) want to make to their own bill. It provides an opportunity for an amendment of the Ney-Wynn bill, the Doolittle bill and the Linder bill, along with numerous other amendments of Members who appeared before the Committee on Rules.

It is a fair rule, one that allows for a full, balanced debate on this very important legislation. This will bring

about, once and for all, a great debate, a debate that the entire House can participate in. The rule that is provided before us, if it is voted up, we have the debate; if it is voted down, it is for those who opposed it to live for another day to demagogue it, rather than vote on it.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the 2000 presidential election may well be remembered for "hanging chads" and other evidence of the imperfections in our electoral system. The right to vote is our most precious freedom. We cannot afford to have a repeat of last fall's problems.

The 2000 presidential election, therefore, should direct our attention once again to the need for campaign and electoral reform. Both political parties are motivated to address the issue in this 107th session of the Congress. I have already cosponsored legislation to provide states with the tools they need to ensure uniformity and improve voter accuracy and access. We must be careful, however, not to let our efforts to achieve voting reform mask the critical problem with our electoral process—the uncontrolled and pernicious influence of big money on the outcome of our elections. So, today, I rise in strong support of the Shays-Meehan legislation, which will help fix many of our system's problems.

It is time for Congress to enact campaign finance reform because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, our federal campaign finance system is broken. Last year, both parties spent unprecedented amounts in soft money for a new record in the campaigns for control of the White House and Congress.

New Mexicans—like all Americans—are justifiably appalled by the fact that the amount of money spent in elections has increased exponentially with no end in sight. The Democratic and Republican national party committees raised a record \$463 million in soft money from January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2000, according to a Common Cause analysis released in February. The amount raised during this past election cycle was nearly double the \$235.9 million raised during the 1995–1996 election cycle. We must take action now.

In the 106th Congress, and again in the 107th, I was elected by my colleagues to take a leadership role on the issue of campaign finance reform in the House of Representatives. In September 1999, I helped floor manage the House's passage of the Shays-Meehan legislation which would have closed some of the worst loopholes in the campaign finance laws. However, this bill never became law because of the opposition of a single Senator.

In spite of this setback, a bipartisan group, led by JOHN MCCAIN and RUSSELL FEINGOLD, have passed their legislation in the other body. It is my hope that, this year, the House will follow suit, and pass meaningful campaign finance reform legislation and that the President will sign it into law.

Current law authorizes contributions by individuals of up to \$1,000 per candidate per election and up to \$5,000 per Political Action Committee (PAC) per election. Corporations and unions are prohibited from making any contributions to candidates or their campaigns.

Nevertheless, individuals, unions, and corporations give contributions of hundreds of thousands of dollars, indeed, millions to campaigns as so-called "soft" money to the political parties themselves. The soft money loop-

hole is based on the fiction that a contribution to the Democratic party or the Republican party is different in reality from a contribution to the party's candidates. It is fiction because parties spend most of the contributions on television campaigns and those campaigns have one goal—electing candidates. Banning unregulated, unlimited contributions to parties is the core of campaign finance reform.

Campaign finance reform is vital to every other piece of legislation that Congress considers. From the very real need for a patients bill of rights to the acute need for a comprehensive national energy policy, to the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit to education reform, the people's voices should be heard and not drowned out by big money. Vested interests have too often been able to exert influence in Congress and White House through the soft money loophole.

Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform is the most important step Congress can take to restore citizens' belief in our democratic process. What better motivation for reform than the egregious excesses of the 2000 election—both in voter access and in campaign contributions? We must act before the 2002 election, before the abuses of the electoral process have so distorted the democratic ideal that we are no longer truly a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. The time is now for real campaign finance reform. Passage of the Shays-Meehan legislation is the only true way to achieve that goal.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by the unprecedented rule that has been developed for consideration of the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform legislation. I have never before seen a rule that divides a Manager's Amendment into 14 separate provisions and requires each of them to be passed individually. The Republican Leadership has really outdone themselves this time in finding new and creative ways to thwart the will of the American people.

Since first being elected to office, I have strongly supported meaningful campaign finance reform. I was so hopeful last year when the House passed Shays-Meehan by an overwhelming vote—only to see it die in the Senate.

This year, we were hopeful again. The Senate has passed McCain-Feingold. The House Leadership committed to allowing a vote on Shays-Meehan.

But the Republican Leadership is still trying to pull the rug from under reform again. The Republican Leadership's rule is designed to make it as difficult as possible for Shays-Meehan to pass in the form its sponsors recommend.

If the Rule is defeated, as I believe it should be, the Leadership should rest assured that supporters of campaign finance reform will not go quietly. The American people have said time and again that they want to see our campaign finance system cleaned up in a meaningful way. Defeating this rule will not defeat this issue. We will be back, and Shays-Meehan will ultimately pass this body.

Americans have lost all confidence in the campaign finance system. Rules like this may cause them to lose all confidence in the U.S. Congress. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and to demand that Shays-Meehan be brought back under a fair rule so that we can do the will of the American people and start

the process of restoring the faith of the American people in their government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 228, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—203

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt      | Gillmor       | Osborne       |
| Akin          | Gilman        | Ose           |
| Armey         | Goode         | Otter         |
| Bachus        | Goodlatte     | Oxley         |
| Baker         | Goss          | Pence         |
| Ballenger     | Granger       | Peterson (PA) |
| Barr          | Graves        | Pickering     |
| Bartlett      | Green (WI)    | Pitts         |
| Barton        | Greenwood     | Platts        |
| Bereuter      | Grucci        | Pombo         |
| Biggert       | Gutknecht     | Portman       |
| Bilirakis     | Hansen        | Pryce (OH)    |
| Blunt         | Hart          | Putnam        |
| Boehner       | Hastert       | Quinn         |
| Bonilla       | Hastings (WA) | Radanovich    |
| Bono          | Hayes         | Ramstad       |
| Brady (TX)    | Hayworth      | Regula        |
| Brown (SC)    | Hefley        | Rehberg       |
| Bryant        | Herger        | Reynolds      |
| Burr          | Hilleary      | Riley         |
| Burton        | Hobson        | Rogers (KY)   |
| Buyer         | Hoekstra      | Rogers (MI)   |
| Callahan      | Horn          | Rohrabacher   |
| Calvert       | Hostettler    | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Camp          | Hulshof       | Royce         |
| Cannon        | Hunter        | Ryan (WI)     |
| Cantor        | Hutchinson    | Ryun (KS)     |
| Capito        | Hyde          | Saxton        |
| Chabot        | Isakson       | Schaffer      |
| Chambliss     | Issa          | Schrock       |
| Coble         | Istook        | Sensenbrenner |
| Collins       | Jenkins       | Sessions      |
| Combest       | Johnson (IL)  | Shadegg       |
| Cooksey       | Johnson, Sam  | Shaw          |
| Cox           | Jones (NC)    | Sherwood      |
| Crane         | Keller        | Shimkus       |
| Crenshaw      | Kelly         | Shuster       |
| Cubin         | Kennedy (MN)  | Simpson       |
| Culberson     | Kerns         | Skeen         |
| Cunningham    | King (NY)     | Smith (MI)    |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Kingston      | Smith (NJ)    |
| Davis, Tom    | Kirk          | Smith (TX)    |
| Deal          | Knollenberg   | Spence        |
| DeLay         | Kolbe         | Stearns       |
| DeMint        | LaHood        | Stump         |
| Diaz-Balart   | Largent       | Sununu        |
| Doolittle     | Latham        | Sweeney       |
| Dreier        | LaTourette    | Tancred       |
| Duncan        | Lewis (KY)    | Tauzin        |
| Dunn          | Linder        | Taylor (NC)   |
| Ehlers        | Lucas (OK)    | Terry         |
| Ehrlich       | Manzullo      | Thomas        |
| Emerson       | McCrery       | Thornberry    |
| English       | McHugh        | Thune         |
| Everett       | McInnis       | Tiahrt        |
| Ferguson      | McKeon        | Tiberi        |
| Flake         | Mica          | Toomey        |
| Fletcher      | Miller (FL)   | Trafficant    |
| Foley         | Miller, Gary  | Vitter        |
| Forbes        | Moran (KS)    | Walden        |
| Fossella      | Myrick        | Walsh         |
| Frelinghuysen | Nethercutt    | Watkins (OK)  |
| Gallely       | Ney           | Watts (OK)    |
| Gekas         | Northup       | Weldon (FL)   |
| Gibbons       | Norwood       | Weldon (PA)   |
| Gilchrest     | Nussle        |               |

Weller  
Whitfield

Wicker  
Wilson

Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—228

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Boehert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank  
Frost  
Ganske  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Klecza  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Scarborough  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shows  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1743

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed his vote from “present” to “yea.”

So the resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 228, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted “yea.”

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 188.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri the schedule for the remainder of the week and for next week.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, for yielding.

We have now finished the legislative business for this week. We will have a pro forma session on Monday. On Tuesday, the House meets at 10 a.m. We have votes scheduled beginning as early as noon.

The flag-burning constitutional amendment will be on Tuesday; Commerce-State-Justice appropriations on Tuesday; then the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act.

Then the balance of the week we will finish Commerce-State-Justice; Foreign Operations appropriations; charitable choice; and hope to have a patients' bill of rights on the floor the balance of the week next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I may inquire further of the gentleman, it is a pretty heavy schedule, the Patients' Bill of Rights, charitable choice, as I understand it.

May I ask the gentleman from Missouri when he expects that the campaign finance bill will come back to the floor? We have a majority, a bipartisan majority in this body who wanted a more fair rule. We hope that the Republican majority will bring another rule that is more equitable, more fair, that recollects the vote that we just had.

I would like to inquire when that might happen.

□ 1745

Mr. BLUNT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we expected, of course, to have the campaign finance bill on the floor tonight. That bill will not be on the floor because of the defeat of the rule, and I think we will just have to look further at the vote

today and the structure of that rule and see when and if that bill can come back to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. So is the gentleman telling us that it may not come back to the floor of the House?

Mr. BLUNT. I am not saying that. I have not had time to calculate this. We really thought we were going to win this rule and vote on this tonight. We thought it was a fair rule, an equitable rule that clearly gave all options. Apparently, the majority did not think that, and I have no further information.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me ask the gentleman when he expects to bring the Patient's Bill of Rights to the floor; at what point next week?

Mr. BLUNT. We do not know yet, but we are hopeful that that bill could be on the floor next week. We think it would be mid to late in the week, if we get it to the floor, but we are hoping that that is one of the things that will come to the floor next week. It is an important issue; needs to be debated and moved forward. We hope we can start and maybe complete that process next week.

Mr. BONIOR. And do we know under what procedure the Patient's Bill of Rights may be brought to the floor next week?

Mr. BLUNT. I am unaware of any procedural decisions that have been made on that.

Mr. BONIOR. On the question of the faith-based initiatives, is that a probable, a maybe, or a most likely next week?

Mr. BLUNT. I think it is most likely that that bill will come out of the Committee on Ways and Means to the floor next week.

Mr. BONIOR. And if I might ask one other question of my friend from Missouri, what other appropriation bills did the gentleman mention that may see the floor action?

Mr. BLUNT. I mentioned we would go to Commerce-Justice, move to finish that and then move to Foreign Operations appropriations next week, if we meet our schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend, and I encourage him to encourage the rest of the leadership on his side of the aisle to bring back a rule that reflects the vote we just had. The American people I think desperately want us to address this campaign finance issue, they want to do it in a fair way, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Connecticut deserve to have a fair shot at the bill that they want on the House floor.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just wanted to announce, for members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that we are going to finish our markup this evening. Food will be provided on a bipartisan basis, so I would

encourage all members of that subcommittee to come back to the markup, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 16, 2001

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, July 16, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2001, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, July 13, 2001, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is confusing as to what just occurred. I just hope that we will have an opportunity to fully address what a good portion of this House wanted to do today, and that is to debate in front of the American people the whole question of ridding this system of special interests.

I, for one, want to discuss the empowerment of those who are least empowered, the involvement of the grass

roots, the inclusion of every voter. And I had hoped that we would have written a rule that would have allowed the kind of formidable debate that would have addressed the question of making sure that democracy prevails in this Nation. I am equally disappointed that we have not given ourselves the opportunity to debate, as the Senate debated, for a period of time for the American voter to understand that we too believe that the best democracy is that of their vote, and that anything that we do in this House is based upon our representation of all of our citizens.

So I hope, as we end this week, that we will act upon the comments of the distinguished minority leader and that we will be able to review this and assess this for further consideration. We do need campaign finance reform.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SIMMONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)



# CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL GROUPS OPPOSED TO SHAYS-MEEHAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I just have some comments on the Shays-Meehan bill. This thing just died of the weight of opposition against it. I just want to read from a list of both conservative and liberal groups who oppose this legislation.

In fact, you could get a positive rating from both the NARL, the National Abortion Rights League, and from the National Right to Life Committee by voting against this terrible bill. And then you can also get the same positive rating from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and from the AFL-CIO.

I would just like to read into the record all these groups, 81 groups, from information obtained from the Committee on House Administration, all the groups who are opposed to the big government's campaign regulation bill, known as Shays-Meehan.

We have the American Civil Rights Union; the American Conservative Union; the Business-Industry PAC; the Center for Reclaiming America; the Christian Coalition; the Free Congress Foundation; Gun Owners Of America; the National Rifle Association; the National Right to Life Committee; the AFL-CIO; the Alliance for Justice; the American Civil Liberties Union; the Cato Institute; the Freedom Forum; the Libertarian Party; the National Association of Broadcasters; the National Association of Manufacturers; Associated Builders and Contractors; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Americans For Tax Reform; the United Auto Workers; the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund; the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; the Business and Professional People for the Public Interest.

Again, just to remind you, Mr. Speaker, these are all the organizations opposed to the big government campaign regulation known as Shays-Meehan.

The Center for Digital Democracy; the Center for Law and Social Policy; the Center for Law in the Public Interest; the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy; the Center for Science in the Public Interest; the Children's Defense Fund; the Community Law Center; the Consumers Union; the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; the Drug Policy Foundation; Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund; Education Law Center; Employment Law Center; and Equal Rights Advocates.

Let me see, the James Madison Center for Free Speech; Gun Owners of America; Free Congress Foundation. Okay, we are at 41. Here are the other 40.

The Food Research and Action Center; the Harmon, Curran, Spielberg &

Eisenberg firm; the Human Rights Campaign Foundation; Institute for Public Representation at Georgetown University Law Center; the Juvenile Law Center; the League of Conservation Voters Education Fund; the Legal Aid Society of New York; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League Foundation; the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; the National Center for Lesbian Rights; the National Center for Youth Law; the National Center on Poverty Law; the National Education Association; the National Employment Lawyers Association; the National Immigration Forum; the National Immigration Law Center; the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; and for number 60, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association; all against the big government, heavy-handed, campaign finance regulation known as Shays-Meehan.

Number 61, and, again, all these groups are opposed, the National Mental Health Association; National Organization for Women Legal Defense; National Partnership for Women and Families; National Veterans Legal Services Program; National Women's Law Center; National Youth Advocacy Coalition; Native American Rights Fund; Natural Resources Defense Council; New York Lawyers for the Public Interest; Physicians for Human Rights; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Public Advocates, Inc.; Public Justice Center; the Tides Center; University of Pennsylvania, Public Service Program; Violence Policy Center; Welfare Law Center; the Wilderness Society; Women's Law Project; and the Youth Law Center.

Eighty-one organizations opposed to the big government, heavy-handed campaign finance bill that went down today known as Shays-Meehan or McCain-Feingold in the Senate. No wonder this proposal is not moving forward. All these groups, from liberal to conservative, are opposed to it. And the Democrats voted to kill the rule that would have brought it up.

□ 1800

## FUNDING FOR FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of faith-based entities who have long worked to address social ills. In fact, we just recently, earlier this week, paid a tribute to the efforts of these entities and encouraged private corporations to contribute to their worthwhile efforts.

This Congress will also likely consider proposals aimed at providing gov-

ernment funding to faith-based entities, Charitable Choice. However, I have grave concerns with those proposals and believe that before adopting them, they merit serious examination to ensure that they do not work to dilute our Nation's constitutional principles and civil rights law.

First, are we prepared to modify our constitutional principle of separation of church and state to one promoting a church state?

The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This clause was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state. In essence, our Nation has been successful in preventing the church from controlling the state and the state from controlling the religion.

The current faith-based proposals threaten this very important principle. Which religious entities will qualify for the government funding? Will the more dominant or better financed faiths be awarded the grants? The government will be forced to choose one religion or denomination over the other.

Once the entities accept government funding, they then must be held accountable for the use of these funds. As such, faith-based entities will open themselves up to government regulation. So we must ask ourselves, will groups forego the full expression of their religious beliefs, their independence and autonomy in exchange for money? Are we comfortable with our houses of worship becoming houses of investigation?

Further, while the proposals state that government funds should not be used for worship or proselytization, meaningful safeguards to prevent such action are not included in the provisions. The consequence is the possibility of use of government funds to promote certain religious beliefs or a beneficiary of social programs being subject to religious influence that is not welcome.

In addition to ensuring that faith-based initiatives do not threaten our Nation's constitutional principles, we must also guarantee that our citizens will remain protected under our civil rights laws. Religious institutions are currently exempted from the ban on religious discrimination and employment provided under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, if faith-based proposals do not include a repeal of this exemption, these institutions will be able to engage in government-funded employment discrimination.

Allowing the exemption to be applied to hiring and staffing decisions by religious entities as they deliver critical services flies in the face of our Nation's long-standing principle that Federal funds may not be used in a discriminatory fashion.

As I reflect on those who fought hard to secure civil rights for us all, and as one who has been a strong advocate myself, I cannot sit idly by and watch

them be eroded. As such, I believe that any faith-based proposals must include a repeal of the Title VII exemption.

As we review faith-based proposals, it is important to note that under current law religious entities can seek government funding by establishing a 501(c)(3) affiliate organization. Such religiously-affiliated organizations have successfully partnered with government and received government funding for years.

I urge my colleagues to carefully examine these issues. As we continue to support faith-based entities and their good works, we must remember our duty to also protect the very foundation of this Nation, our Constitution and our civil rights laws. Let us stand against discrimination and stand up for religious tolerance and freedom.

#### PAYING HOMAGE TO A SPECIAL GROUP OF VETERANS, SURVIVORS OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as a designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay homage to a very special group of American veterans. As all veterans, these World War II survivors have sacrificed and have suffered for their country. But this special group is different.

This group that I would like to call attention to tonight are men who continue to fight for justice even though these many years have passed since the close of World War II. These are men who fought and paid an enormous price for our freedom and for the peace and safety of the world, yet today, I repeat, continuing to struggle for justice to their own cause.

Instead of fighting the emperors of Japan which they fought during the second World War, these brave veterans are now forced to fight lawyers, the lawyers of Japanese and international business giants, companies like Mitsubishi, Matsui and Nippon Steel. Instead of battling in the jungles, instead of battling on the islands in the South Pacific, these veterans are battling in the courtroom.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest irony about what is happening today about the veterans of whom I speak, while they battled for our freedom in the Second World War, and today, as they say, they are battling lawyers of some of the biggest Japanese companies, the greatest irony is that these American heroes have the United States Government not on their side, but on the side of their adversary. They find themselves arguing against representatives of their own government.

Let me make this clear. Some heroic veterans from World War II were trying to find justice for their cause, men who put everything on the line and, as we

will find out, were held hostage and prisoner of war by the Japanese, these men now in seeking justice for their cause are having to argue against their own government. Their own government is now engaged in a legal process to thwart their efforts.

This is the story of the American survivors of the Bataan Death March in Corregidor. These are some of the most heroic of America's defenders during the Second World War. When they were captured, they were forced to serve as slave labor for private war profiteering companies, Japanese companies during the Second World War. These men, these prisoners of war, these American heroes were deprived of food, medicine and clean water. These large Japanese companies, whose own work force was away fighting the war in the Japanese uniform, these corporations used our POWs as work animals. These Japanese companies, knowing that they were violating the international law, used our American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines whom they had captured in the Philippines and other places around the Pacific, but mainly the Philippines, they used these people and often worked them to death. The standards they had to endure violated the most basic morality, decency and justice. It also violated international law.

Instead of righting wrongs and admitting that violations had been made and violations of law existed, like German companies have done since the end of World War II, and the German companies have tried to close that chapter by giving compensation and recognizing the violation of rights that took place by their companies to the people whom they wronged, the Japanese corporations have ignored the claims of these American heroes.

And why should they not? These large Japanese corporations ignore the pleas of American survivors for justice. Why not? After all, the United States State Department has sided with the Japanese and is working against our former POWs that were held by the Japanese during the Second World War. This is a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people knew what was going on, I am sure there would be a wave of protest and indignation that would sweep this country, a wave that would sweep right into the State Department and perhaps sweep out these individuals who are siding in a battle against America's most heroic defenders.

Dr. Lester Tenney, a survivor of the death march, a survivor of slave camps, says, "I feel as if I am once again being sacrificed by our government, abandoned not for the war effort, as in the past, but for the benefit of big Japanese corporations."

Dr. Tenney is right. In the hours following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese attacked U.S. installations in the Philippines. A U.S. contingent there made up of our military forces retreated to the Bataan Peninsula and

made their historic standing. They held off the Japanese military juggernaut while the United States had been crippled in Pearl Harbor, and gave us time to rally America, and gave us time to, and gave us time to organize an offensive to take back the territory that the Japanese had taken.

Our defenders in Corregidor and on the Bataan Peninsula bought time for the whole United States, and they bought time at the greatest risk to their lives. Our government at that time was forced to make a heart-tearing decision, and that decision was that they were going to have to sacrifice our brave heroes in the Philippines. MacArthur was pulled out, and our troops were left behind. And they were sacrificed because the planners in Washington, D.C., knew full well that much of our strength in the Pacific had been destroyed at Pearl Harbor, and if we tried to save these brave heroes on the Bataan Peninsula, we would have risked so many other military personnel. If we lost that battle, the entire war would have been lost. The risk was so great that it was impossible for us to go to save them.

Yet these men and women, these brave defenders stood their ground and fought a heroic battle. As the song of the day went, their song, the battling bastards of Bataan, no mama, no papa, no Uncle Sam.

After the fall of Bataan, after these men were overwhelmed and American-Filipino troops were captured, they were forced to walk more than 60 miles to their places of captivity, to the prison camps and concentration camps in which they were held. That 60-mile march is known in history as the Bataan Death March. They were denied water, beaten; and during the march, hundreds of them, many of them fell, and many of them were bayoneted to death. Some of them were cut to pieces, at least a few beheaded by Japanese officers who were practicing with their samurai sword.

Let us remember at that time the Japanese culture reflected the view that any warrior who survived a battle and was on the losing side of the battle, any warrior who survived and surrendered was unfit to be considered a human being.

□ 1815

The Japanese treated our prisoners as less than human beings. They treated them as animals and they murdered them. Over 650 to 700 Americans died on that 60-mile march, the famous Bataan Death March. These were truly heroes, and their sacrifice inspired our Nation. The outrage that swept across our Nation gave us strength to fight against the Japanese militarist thrust in the Pacific and to stand up to the Nazis in Europe, because we saw the heroism of these men. And then, after enduring this hell and taken out of sight of the American people, our prisoners of war that were being held by Japan there in the Philippines, many

thousands of them were taken from the Philippines in what are called hell ships. These hell ships took our prisoners to Japan and to Japanese-occupied territories like Manchuria, they were packed into the cargo hold of these ships, and our POWs struggled just to grasp a little air in temperatures that reached 125 degrees. It is estimated that over 4,000 Americans died aboard these ships that were transporting them to, as I say, other Japanese-held territories, especially the islands of Japan itself and in Manchuria.

Our POWs struggled to survive in the harshest conditions imaginable. These heroes were forced to toil beyond human endurance, in mines, in factories, in shipyards, in steel mills. Yes, they took the place of the Japanese men who were away serving in the Japanese military. This was in itself a violation of international law. But the jobs that these prisoners were given, these American heroes were given by the Japanese and the treatment they received was well beyond just a violation of international law; it was a crime against humanity.

They worked the most dangerous jobs, the most terrible conditions, and were treated like animals. They were treated worse than animals. The Japanese would not have treated their animals as they treated our prisoners. Company employees would beat them and harangue them. They were starved and denied adequate medical care. They suffered from dysentery, scurvy, pellagra, malaria, diphtheria, pneumonia and other diseases. One of our prisoners of war had his leg amputated because it was crushed in a rock slide, and it was amputated by another American POW, the only doctor who happened to have survived this long, and that doctor amputated that leg without anesthetic. The rations that they were given were unfit for human consumption. Our POWs were reduced to skin and bone, looking very much like the prisoners in Auschwitz and in the concentration camps in Europe.

Today, while many of those survivors, of course, died during the war and after the war just from the complications, and today those who managed to survive over these many years have many health problems that relate directly to their slave labor and the conditions that they were kept in during the Second World War. When you hear the survivors tell their stories, it raises the hair right in the back of your neck and sends chills down your body.

Frank Bigelow, 78 years old, from Brooksville, Florida, was taken prisoner at Corregidor. Mr. Bigelow was shipped to Japan where he performed labor in coal mines owned and operated by Mitsubishi. Now, this is a name that we have heard. Mitsubishi. "We were told to work or die," Mr. Bigelow recalls. Injured in a mining accident and, as I mentioned a moment ago, it was Mr. Bigelow who had his leg amputated without anesthetic by a fellow POW.

At the war's end, though Mr. Bigelow was 6'4", he weighed just 95 pounds when he was liberated.

Lester Tenney, 80 years old, of La Jolla, California, became a prisoner at the fall of Bataan in April of 1942. He survived the Bataan Death March and was transported to Japan aboard a hell ship. In Japan, he was sold by the Japanese Government to Mitsui and forced to labor for 12 hours a day, 28 days a month in the Mitsui coal mine.

"The reward I received for this hard labor was being beaten by civilian workers in the mine and constantly humiliated," said Dr. Tenney. These are just a couple of stories. The horrors that they suffered at the hands of these Japanese corporations, who were making a profit off the work they were doing for the war, the horrors that these men suffered could fill books; and let us in those books and in this recalling what happened not forget who it was who was doing this. These were Japanese corporations. Many of these same Japanese corporations still exist today.

The case of our POWs is clear. These facts cannot be denied. Their claims cannot be dismissed or just simply explained away. And that is why it makes it even more difficult for us to understand why our State Department refuses to assist these American heroes, these veterans of the Bataan Death March, these men who stood at a time when it took such great courage and endured the unspeakable for us, and now our State Department will not stand with them. In fact, it is standing against them.

It makes it hard to fathom when you think about this why the State Department is doing this when you consider that in Germany, in Nazi Germany, where so many people were wronged and we know about what happened in the concentration camps there and how horrible that was, the Germans have tried to compensate those people, especially German corporations, have tried to compensate those people who they wronged during the war. They have tried to close the book. That is what should happen.

But instead, on the other side of the world, our American heroes have been denied justice by these Japanese corporations. And while our government has encouraged the repayment by German corporations and especially in the case of, for example, Swiss bankers who were ripping off the Holocaust survivors from the deposits that their families had made and the huge German insurance companies, while we have encouraged that and tried to side with those victims, our own State Department and our government are siding against our defenders who were captured by the Japanese and mistreated in a very similar way.

The lawyers for the State Department have allied themselves with the war profiteers, these Japanese corporations who made enormous profits in supplying Tokyo's war efforts, and

they have allied themselves against the American victims. Let me just say that their excuse for what they are doing is that they are claiming that the peace treaty that we signed with Japan bars our veterans from these claims. Let me note that that is nonsense. It is total nonsense. If any claims are barred, it is claims against the Japanese Government by American civilians. There is nothing in that treaty that bars our heroic POWs from suing the Japanese corporations that treated them like animals, that violated their human rights and committed war crimes in doing so.

The argument by our State Department is an argument in which our own government is bending over backwards to try to find an excuse for this great violation of rights of our greatest heroes; they are bending over backwards to try to find an excuse when, in fact, these people deserve us to be doing everything we possibly can to try to find the arguments on their side.

These people are not going to be with us for very long. These people might not be with us for another 10 years. They are dying off every day. They are older men. And our government is trying to do its best to try to find arguments, to try to undercut their claims against the people who violated their rights, the Japanese corporations that treated them like slave labor during the war. We should be paying honor to these men, and we should be doing everything we can to help them rather than put roadblocks in their way. The State Department should be ashamed of itself.

First, as the State Department has elsewhere conceded, the waiver of claims by U.S. private citizens against private companies of another country is not merely unprecedented in history, in the history of the United States, it is not recognized in international law and raises very serious constitutional and fifth amendment questions.

What we are talking about here is that there is no State Department waiver of the rights of private citizens to sue people who have violated their rights and they have a just claim. There is no right of our government to waive that, the rights of our citizens. Now, they maybe can waive the rights against a government, but they certainly cannot waive a claim against a corporation that still exists.

By the way, let us remember this: a corporation is a legal entity. If that corporation made mistakes in the past and it is the same corporate entity, it has responsibilities for what the actions of that corporation took in years past. I do not care if it was during the war or during peacetime. A Japanese corporation bears the same responsibility as an individual bears a responsibility. That is why you have corporations. They take upon themselves that legal responsibility.

A close look at the history of the 1951 treaty that we have that ended the war with Japan reveals that the negotiators considered treaty language

which would have permitted POW lawsuits against Japanese companies, those same Japanese companies that had used them as slave labor. But that reference was deleted in the final draft after a demand by other Allied powers was made to that agreement, to that wording to the U.S. delegation.

Now, what does that mean? What is going on here is that we considered actually putting something in the treaty that specifically permitted them. Well, the argument was that we can't constitutionally prevent them from doing it, anyway, so why are we putting this in the treaty that could probably be a cause of concern for the Japanese?

And why were we so concerned about the Japanese in 1951? What was that all about? Well, 1951 was another era. And I am afraid that in 1942 when America had to abandon these heroes on the Bataan Peninsula and leave them to their fate and let them be captured and murdered and tortured and worked like slave labor by the Japanese, when we abandoned them to that fate, we abandoned them a second time. That was because again America's security was in jeopardy. America's security was in jeopardy because during the Cold War we needed Japan on our side. And perhaps that was the motive at that time of our government and of the State Department and of people who were concerned about our country, and perhaps these survivors of the Bataan Death March can understand that.

Because at that time had the world witnessed a Japan going towards communism, it would have shifted the balance of freedom and democracy in the world and the whole Cold War might have ended a different way. It might have caused the loss of millions of American lives if just that balance of power in Japan would have been shifted. So maybe we needed to bend over backwards to prevent the Japanese at that time, and I just say maybe.

□ 1830

There is no excuse like that today. The Cold War is over. We should not be bending over backwards today. If we do not move forward today to permit these American heroes to at least redress their grievances and to receive some compensation and to find justice, if we do not act now, we are abandoning them for the third time.

They were abandoned in Bataan. They were abandoned after the war. Are we going to abandon them again? Are we going to watch them slip away quietly without knowing how much the American people appreciated what they did for us? How will they know how much we appreciated it if we are turning our backs on this claim, this legitimate claim they have against Japanese corporations who worked them as slave laborers while all around the world other peoples have been able to sue those corporations that violated their human rights during the Second World War and how other people, in fact, have been able to sue Japan and those corporations for what they did to them.

No, the only people left out will be the survivors of the Bataan Death March. This is an insult. It is absurd. It is insane. It does not speak well of our State Department. It does not speak well of us if we let it happen, and we should not and we will not let that happen.

The treaty in 1951 also includes a clause which automatically and unconditionally extends to the allied powers any more favorable terms than that granted by Japan in any other war claims settlement. Japan has entered into war claims settlements with the Soviet Union, with Burma, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, the Netherlands and others. These same rights that we are talking about, that we are asking for our own people, have already been granted to the people of other countries. Yet, the State Department in our country continues to work against our heroic Bataan Death March survivors' right to seek justice in the courts against the Japanese corporations that worked them during the war, even though other countries and other peoples have received justice and the book has been closed on their cases.

On the public record to date, the State Department simply ignores these people's claims, these brave heroes' claims, or tries to obfuscate the facts. Several weeks ago, Fox News on the Fox News Sunday program, a news program on the weekend, it was probably more like 2 months ago now, Colin Powell, our Secretary of State, promised to review the State Department's erroneous and unyielding stand against the Bataan Death March survivors. He provided a little bit of hope that the survivors may well be able to obtain justice at long last.

I have yet to hear, and that might have been 6 weeks to 2 months ago, I have yet to hear from the Secretary of State. I would hope that the bureaucrats over at the State Department get this message tonight. We expect the Secretary to pay attention to this issue, and we expect that our country and our government to be more concerned with these claims than they have been in the past and that we expect them to be on the side of our people rather than the side of these Japanese corporations.

We have a Japanese prime minister who has visited this country. We have had exchanges with the Japanese government going on. We have a new ambassador that is being appointed to Japan, Howard Baker. This issue should not go away. This issue should be something that our representatives bring up with representatives of the Japanese government, and that we should change the rules of engagement, so to speak, so that our heroes can at last receive justice.

Of the more than 36,000 American soldiers who were captured by the Japanese, only 21,000 made it home. The death rates for American POWs, this is an important statistic, the death rate for American POWs was 30 times great-

er in Japanese prison camps than in German prison camps.

I met recently with a member of the Japanese Embassy staff, and he said that it was unfair of me to compare the Japanese in World War II to the Germans and to the Nazis and that is just not the case. I told him, I said with all due respect, sir, the Japanese militarists of World War II, of which this gentleman's generation he was not part of that generation, committed the same type of atrocities and war crimes as did the Germans, and it is very comparable what the Japanese did to the Chinese people, for example, but also to every prisoner that they captured.

Again, I reminded this young man from the Japanese Embassy that his generation does not bear responsibility for this. He was not even alive. But those Japanese corporations that existed at that time and were involved in that behavior do bear legal responsibility, and that the Japanese people today, our efforts to receive justice for these American POWs, we in no way mean it as a slap in the face against the Japanese people of today. The Japanese people of today have a strong democracy and they have around the world proven themselves to be a force for good, but during the Second World War these were not the same Japanese people. They had different values. They had different values and they were a different people. They were told at that time they had been trained from youth to be militaristic and to brutalize anyone who was weaker than them, especially soldiers who surrendered.

Even though the Japanese companies profited from the slave labor, these companies have never even offered an apology, much less repayment to our POWs. Today, as I say, there are fewer than 5,400 surviving POWs. These survivors are pursuing justice not just for themselves but for their widows and for their families of these POWs who died prematurely because of the conditions that they lived under during the war. The POWs finally have a chance for justice and we should not, we cannot, abandon them again.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and myself have introduced a bill. It is the Justice for POWs Act of 2001. It is H.R. 1198, and there are over 100 of my colleagues now who have cosponsored this bill which will grant our POWs from the Bataan Death March the right to sue those Japanese corporations that tortured them and worked them as animals during the war. Our legislation gives them that right to seek legal redress against those companies.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from La Jolla, California (Mr. ISSA), from southern Orange County and northern San Diego County.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise and came here with the profound desire to speak just a few moments in support of the very courageous legislation of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER). I, like the gentleman, was

not alive and did not participate in World War II but what I do understand, having dealt with people from around the world and especially in Asia, that this is exactly the kind of a bill that Japan, for their own sake, needs to make sure is paid.

The people of Japan are very interested in face. They are also a people who never fail to pay a just debt. This is a just debt. When people work in any capacity, they need to be paid. No Japanese employer, not Mitsubishi, not any of the heavy industry companies that we are talking about here today, not one of them would fail to pay a worker for a day's work. This is the only time in which these companies have gotten labor for which they have not yet paid.

I absolutely support the legislation of the gentleman. I commend him for something that has been long overdue for bringing it to the forefront. I am pleased to be one of the cosponsors; and I look forward to pushing this through the Congress to, in fact, remind the Japanese people that this is the only way they will put the war behind them is to pay the debts that they know they owe, have the corporations pay what they need to pay, with interest, and move on. That is what we do in a civilized society.

Japan is now one of the great nations of the civilized world, and we need them to free themselves of the burden of this past debt. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman once again for authoring this bill with the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA). And I look forward to seeing it on the floor and enacted.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), I might add, is one of the great entrepreneurs as well as patriots here in the Congress. I would like to ask him a question. I have no corporate background myself, but I made several times the point that corporations do have responsibility for their actions. Even though it happened a while ago, a corporation would still have legal responsibility for the actions in the past?

Mr. ISSA. Here in America, we have unlimited and permanent liability. There are cases on the American books where a lathe maker who made products in the 1930s had to pay for damages caused to a worker in the 1980s. That is not always considered fair, but corporations understand that one of the advantages they get for that pride of having a plaque that says 50 years or even 100 years in business is in fact that they have to have paid off all of their debts, including the ones that have not yet arisen.

That kind of obligation is understood here in America and very much understood in Japan. As a matter of fact, it is probably more understood in Japan.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me also note, and it is important for us to make this point because not only are we talking today to the Japa-

nese people and to the American people, we are talking about our relations between our countries and I do not want anyone to think that the American people or even this American thinks less of the Japanese people and that this is in some way anti-Japanese. The co-author of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), is one of two Japanese Americans who is a Member of Congress. The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), during the Second World War, his family was interned during the Second World War here in the United States. The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is certainly not anti-Japanese whatsoever, and I do not consider myself anti-Japanese at all.

I, in fact, lived in Japan when I was a younger person, and I visited Japan on numerous occasions. My family has many Japanese friends. This in no way is an attack on the Japanese people of today. What we are suggesting in H.R. 1198 is that there is a debt to be paid. Japanese corporations, as the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) has just stated, have a legal debt to pay and our State Department and our government should not be thwarting these heroic Americans in trying to go to court and receive justice that they deserve for being treated like they were by Japanese corporations during the Second World War.

However, the Japanese people themselves did not commit these crimes today. The Japanese people of today did not commit these crimes, and I do not believe that they personally should be held responsible at all. In fact, as I say, over the last 20 years, Japan has worked with the United States to promote democracy. Japan has had a democratic system. We have a relatively free press, and we have had a situation of freedom of religion, et cetera. And Japan has played a very positive role in this world; but during the Second World War and in the beginning decades of this century, that was not the case.

Now, many people probably wonder why I got involved in this in the first place. If I do not have a grudge to bear against the Japanese people, which I do not, and I acknowledge they are wonderful people and it is a wonderful country, I acknowledge that today and I have many Japanese friends, why am I doing this?

□ 1845

Why am I the author of H.R. 1198? Well, I can tell you, it is a very easy answer, but it requires a little story. I was married about 3½ years ago to the love of my life, Rhonda Carmony, who is now Rhonda Rohrabacher. Rhonda's father, my wife's father, passed away about 5 years ago of cancer, and at our wedding someone else had to give her away because her father had passed away.

You might say the grand old man of Rhonda's family is a man named Uncle Lou. Now, Uncle Lou is a survivor of

the Bataan Death March, who was taken by the Japanese to Manchuria and worked and lived in a slave labor camp, in a concentration camp in Manchuria, until the closing days of the war when he was liberated, and Uncle Lou told me the stories, and I met with Uncle Lou's friends who told me the stories of their ordeal.

These men, who are probably some of the most heroic people I have ever met, told me of the conditions they were kept in, and then they told me that they were unable to sue these Japanese corporations who had used them as slave labor, and they were unable to find justice through the legal system because our own State Department was thwarting them.

My goal is not to humiliate the Japanese or to make the Japanese feel bad, even though in the past they did bad things. The Japanese people did bad things in the distant past, and that was another generation. My goal is to do justice for Uncle Lou and those 5,400 American heroes who survived the Bataan Death March. That is what our goal is.

Before they pass away, let us give them justice. We need to pass H.R. 1198. We need to pass H.R. 1198. It needs to come to the floor for a vote, and we need to do justice by these men and give them a thank you, a thank you for what they did for our country.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that would help Japanese-American relations more than to close this chapter in an honest and honorable way. Nothing would be better for Japanese-American relations than for us to pass H.R. 1198 and to have these Japanese corporations then seek to find a settlement with our American POWs and just close the chapter. Let us finish this. Let us end it in an honorable way before these men die.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in requesting our leadership to bring H.R. 1198 to the floor. I would hope that people would talk to their Members of Congress and get them to support my bill, Congressman DANA ROHRABACHER's bill, H.R. 1198.

Now, when we talk about Japan and we talk about how we reacted and how we react today and are we going to do what is right, those same decisions, we are right now trying to close this chapter, but let us learn from this chapter in history. We need to learn from this chapter in history because some other things are going on in this town that go right back to the lessons that we should have learned by the sacrifices of these men in the Bataan Death March and our soldiers who gave their lives, the men and women who gave their lives and put their lives on the line during World War II.

You see, Uncle Lou was captured in the Bataan Death March, but my own father, who passed away 3 years ago, my father was part of the Marine military. He was a pilot during the Second World War who took part in the liberation of the Philippines. So my father

helped push the Japanese out of the Philippines, and Uncle Lou was captured there when they took over the Philippines in the first place.

That generation is passing away. My father fought during World War II, and during the Cold War, he was in the Marine Corps, and there are a lot of lessons to learn from that generation. We owe so much to that generation.

Next week, or sometime soon, I am not sure if it will be on the calendar next week, we may be voting on a waiver that will grant normal trade relations to Communist China. We need to learn from the lessons of history. We need to remember the sacrifices of our brave defenders, like Uncle Lou, and, yes, my father as well.

It seems the more things change, the more they stay the same. During the 1920s and 1930s, a militaristic Japan was the primary threat to peace and freedom in Asia, and, yes, as part of its alliance with the Nazis in Europe, that Axis power, that Axis alliance, was the greatest threat to freedom and peace in the world. They were about to usher in a new dark age and destroy or put freedom wherever it was under threat.

During the 1920s and 1930s, and, by the way, Japan could have gone either way at the turn of the century, and we did not support the democratic movement in Japan. They were murdered, and the internal politics in Japan, the militarists kept control of Japan and murdered the democratic opposition there, and by the second decade of that last century, in the 1920s, Japan emerged as a militaristic expansionist power in the Pacific, and they emerged as a potential enemy of the United States because of that.

The Japanese, as I say, were the primary threat in Asia. They were a fanatical tyranny in the 1920s and 1930s. They were racist. They thought they were racially superior and had a right to dominate all of Asia. As I say, they were militaristic, they were beefing up their military, and they were expansionists. They were taking control of islands and fortifying them all over the Pacific as they built up their own military into an offensive power.

Last, which is an interesting comparison, they were also involved with trade with the United States. They were a wealthy power. They had a very strong economy and a high standard of living, and they depended a great deal on trade with the United States. In fact, the Japanese were engaged in a lot of business with American corporations, and we provided them, at a great profit to these American corporations, I might add, we provided them with steel and oil and scrap metal, and, yes, even some of our aerospace companies were involved with working with the Japanese. All of this, if it rings true a little bit when you think about the comparisons about what has been happening with the Communist Chinese, it is rather frightening.

Yes, there have been reports of, and we know now that some of America's

aerospace corporations are actually cooperating with them, and one of our companies is actually trying to develop a manufacturing unit that would help them manufacture their equivalent of the B-17, a long-range bomber.

This is incredible now. What American corporation would do this at a time when the Japanese were the biggest human rights abuser in the world by what they had been doing in China and to the people that they had subjugated, and that they were militaristic and a threat, and they were dictatorial, with no sight of liberalization? Why would we let American corporations guide American policy while that was going on?

That is with precisely what was going on then, and that is precisely what happened, and that is what is precisely happening today. The Communist Chinese are the greatest threat to peace and freedom in Asia today, and, in fact, I would say in the world today, because they are allied with the worst and most evil forces in the world, just as the Japanese militarists were during the 1920s and 1930s.

The Chinese Communists are a fanatical tyranny. Those ruthless individuals who control Communist China will let nothing get in their way or nothing threaten their power. They are a fanatical tyranny, just like the Japanese militarists of World War II and before that. If you watch the Chinese military marching along, one can only be reminded of the Japanese troops that marched in that very same arrogant fashion.

Yes, the Chinese who control Beijing today are racist. They believe that they have a superior race and that they have a right to dominate all of Asia. And, yes, of course, they are militaristic.

The worst part of their military expansion, however, is that the United States of America, in permitting the economic rules of engagement in which we interact with Communist China, is permitting the Communist Chinese to have an \$80 billion annual trade surplus with the United States. With this \$80 billion of hard currency, what is being done by the Communist Chinese? What is being done is they are building up their military. They are acquiring weapons systems that will enable them to incinerate Americans by the millions in terms of their nuclear weapons capacity and their missile capacity. But they are also obtaining weapons that will permit them to sink American aircraft carriers and shoot down American airplanes and to kill American military personnel.

They are not only militaristic, however, they are also expansionists, just as the Japanese were expansionists. Take a look at what the Japanese claimed. They had a map of the coprosperity sphere. We have Chinese maps which show they, too, believe there is a coprosperity sphere, and guess who is in the center of it? And it is a far greater area of control that the Chinese have in mind than the Japanese.

The Chinese have in mind that they control the entire South China Sea, that they control all the way up to the shoreline of the Philippines and of Indonesia and of Vietnam and Southeast Asia. They have a right to control all of Tibet and the greater expanses of Asia and Southeast Asia, and they have a right to the great Siberian areas of Russia.

This is an expansionist power. These are people who are mad with power, just as the Japanese militarists were in the 1920s and 1930s. And just as the Japanese militarists were fortifying islands with their military weapons and their capabilities during the 1920s and 1930s, China is in the process of doing that now.

In the Spratly Islands, which are an island chain that are claimed by five different countries and are 600 miles away from China, but about 100 miles away from the Philippines, and also mainly claimed by the Philippines, Chinese Communists are in the middle of an island grab, and what they are doing is sending their warships there, and they have already built fortifications.

Let me add that I, this Congressman, DANA ROHRBACHER, tried to visit the Spratly Islands. For years I tried to visit the Spratly Islands and was prevented from doing so by roadblocks that were put up by who? Who do you think put up those roadblocks so as a Member of Congress, as a Member of the Committee on International Relations, that I would not be able to see what the Communist Chinese were doing in the Spratly Islands? Who put up those roadblocks? My gosh, the same company that is preventing our POWs from suing the Japanese. It is called the United States State Department.

So when I finally got to the Spratly Islands on an old C-130, I might add, from the Philippine military, it was the only one that could fly, I managed to fly out in an old C-130. I had Skunk Baxter with me and a couple of staffers and some folks from the Government of the Philippines. The pilot did not even have a GPS. That is how poor the Philippines are, they did not have a GPS system in the only C-130 flying, and they had a Radio Shack GPS system.

But we made our way to the Spratly Islands. We came out of a cloud bank, and there were three huge Chinese military warships, and what we saw in the Spratly Islands was the Chinese fortifying those islands with military fortifications. This is somebody else's country and somebody else's territory, and they are fortifying it, and they have Chinese warships in the lagoon. Those Chinese sailors were rushing towards their guns, and we did not know if they were going to try to shoot us down or what, and they did not, and we finally escaped that international incident.

Since that time, guess what has happened? We have let them get away with it. We have let them not only lay their claim, but actually build forts there.



Now what have they done? They have done the same thing in the South China Sea, in the Paracel Islands down off of Vietnam.

□ 1900

They have also, I might add, since that time begun to send their naval war vessels right up to the coast of the Philippines. A few weeks ago, Chinese war ships were within a short distance from the coast of the Philippines. This is an expansionist power. This is a power that threatens. This is the world's worst human rights abuser. As Japan was the world's worst human rights abuser in the 1920s and 1930s, the Chinese are the same with us today. They are expansionist, they are racist, they are militaristic. Yet we have a trade status with them that permits them an \$80 billion surplus.

Now, why do we do this? Within the next couple of weeks, why will this body vote to give that kind of country Normal Trade Relations with the United States? I repeat that: Normal Trade Relations. Should a communist dictatorship have Normal Trade Relations? Should a fanatical tyranny that is racist, the world's worst human rights abuser, a country that is expanding its military power, an expansionist in its territory, is this the kind of country that we want to give Normal Trade Relations to?

Mr. Speaker, I believe in free trade. I am a Republican free-trader. But I believe in free trade between free people. If we try to do it the other way around, we are doing nothing but bolstering the regime in power in these dictatorial countries around the world.

How long ago was it? Just a few short weeks ago that 24 military American personnel that were being held hostage by this very same Communist Chinese Government. They, in fact, forced an American surveillance aircraft that was in international waters out of the air in an attempt to murder those 24 American service personnel. Instead, the plane made its way to Hainan Island, luckily; and then they were held hostage for 11 days. That was not so long ago. And now, within a very short period of time, the elected Members of this body are going to vote by a majority to give Normal Trade Relations to that government. That does not make any sense.

Not only were they holding hostage our American military personnel, but we actually have several Americans who are being held right now as we speak, or at least legal residents of the United States, who are being held hostage or being held prisoner by the Chinese, and we are basically talking about giving Normal Trade Relations to a country that is holding Americans, or at least legal residents of our country, holding them illegally, committing torture.

There was a young lady and her daughter who came to our hearing of the Committee on International Relations. Her husband, who is a doctor, a

Ph.D., is being held by the Communist Chinese, and her daughter and this lady were begging us: please, please, demand that they bring back my husband, and he is an academic. He is an academic.

The Communist Chinese today are doing what? They are murdering Falon Gong people. Falon Gong, by the way, is nothing more than a meditation cult. I mean, they meditate and they have yoga; and they are being imprisoned by the tens of thousands and hundreds of them are being murdered in jail, hundreds of them. Many of these women, they are being tortured, not to mention Christians, of course, who, if you do not register like the Jews did with the Nazis, if you do not register, you get thrown in a gulag. What happens in China? What happens in China when you get thrown into the gulag? Yes, right back to World War II. Guess what? Their prisoners are worked like animals.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we should not be granting Normal Trade Relations to a country like this. And when those prisoners are executed, and thousands of them are, China is the execution capital of the world, what does this ghoulish regime in China do? It sends doctors, their doctors out to harvest the organs from the bodies of the prisoners that they have just executed.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time that we learn our lessons from history, not grant Normal Trade Relations with China, and to make sure we stand up for the rights of our own people and the freedom and dignity of our ex-POWs.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 130

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Jeri Thomson as Secretary of the Senate.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M., FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2001, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS ACT OF 2001

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m. on Friday, July 13, 2001, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this Chamber, and as one who has supported campaign finance reform and fought for campaign finance reform for close to 10 years, I need to express my great disappointment in the vote that occurred earlier today in which we defeated the rule on campaign finance reform legislation and, thus, have disallowed that legislation from coming forward.

Before I share exactly how I voted, though, I think it is important to share some of my history on this issue and how I live campaign finance reform and not just talk about it.

Over the last 9½ years as a candidate first in the State House and now in Congress, I have never accepted political action committee money. I have limited the amount of money I have spent; I have limited the amount of my personal money I have spent. In fact, in my campaign for Congress a year ago, I limited my expenditures in the primary to less than \$150,000; and I was outspent five to one by one opponent, three to one by another, two to one by a third opponent. We did grass-roots campaigning; and thanks to the people of my district, we were successful. I ran in that fashion because I believe money is wrongly influencing the governing process, and I think it is time we do better by the people we are elected to represent.

Unfortunately, we did not get that opportunity today; and despite my strong support for campaign finance reform; in fact, in the June 30 reports of this year, I imagine I will probably pretty easily be the Member with the lowest amount, with \$7,000, maybe \$8,000 in my campaign treasury, compared to hundreds of thousands of dollars, because I am not interested in being a fund-raiser, I am interested in being a public servant. But despite that history, despite that I seek not just to preach about campaign finance reform, but to try to practice campaign finance reform, citizens may be surprised to learn that I voted against the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the maker of the underlying bill that was to come before the House; I voted against the position of the distinguished Senator from Arizona who wanted a vote against the rule. I think it is important that we discuss why I voted that way, even as an adamant supporter of campaign finance reform.

I would contend that the defeat of the rule and, thus, the disallowance of the bill coming up for a vote is a huge step backwards. What we have done is send the bill back to committee where it may never come out of for the rest of the session; and under the best-case scenario under the rules of this House, it will at least be several months before we get another opportunity to bring it to the floor.

What was the alternative if we had supported the rule and brought it forward? Was it perfect? No. In fact, if I



had my druthers, I would go one heck of a lot further than we were proposing to do in the underlying legislation and the amendments. But if we had allowed it to come forward, if we had approved the rule, we would have had the gentleman's bill before this House, a very comprehensive campaign finance reform piece of legislation. We would have had 17 amendments before this House, 12 of which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was preparing to offer. We would have had the opportunity for two substitute campaign finance reform bills to be discussed, debated, and openly voted on in this House. What did we get? Nothing. Not one vote. We got a rule denial that sent it back to committee, and we have lost tremendous ground.

The worst-case scenario that could have occurred if we had supported the rule, that we would move a piece of legislation forward either that was in such good form and in such similar form as the Senate legislation, as the McCain-Feingold legislation, that the Senate would have concurred in it, and we would have taken a huge step to eliminating soft money, to reducing the influence of money on the process. Under the worst-case scenario, we move forward and come out with a bill that the Senate did not like, we go to conference. So we are in conference where we can hammer it out between the Senate and the House. Instead, we are still in a committee in the House, a long way from getting to a final piece of legislation.

What was the grounds for defeating the rule, those who voted against the rule. Why? What did they not like about the rule? It came down to this. This is important for the citizens of this Nation to understand. It came down to procedure over substance. It was not a question of whether each and every one of the gentleman's amendments was going to get a vote. All 12 of them under the rule would get a vote. It is that he and others wanted them all to be voted as one, in one lump sum, they had to take it or leave it, one lump sum. Do I not think that was a good approach? I think the 12 amendments was fair, was reasonable. Each and every amendment would have gotten a vote on the floor; it would have been openly discussed and debated. Instead, none of them came to the floor and the underlying bill did not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, I think. As one who has fought for this reform, and we got so close to getting a substantive vote, and instead, we are back in committee. All 228 members who voted against the rule, if they so strongly believe the rule was flawed, I would encourage each and every one of them and I would hope that each and

every one of them will bring forward a discharge resolution with what they think we should do and that all 228 are on that discharge resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we as a House do campaign finance reform once and for all and do it right.

#### STATUS REPORT ON THE CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2002 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through July 11, 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accompanying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed

to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the established limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only. The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned by the budget resolution.

#### REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83

(Reflecting action completed as of July 11, 2001—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

|   | Fiscal year— |                  |
|---|--------------|------------------|
|   | 2002         | 2002–2006        |
| Appropriate Level:                                    |              |                  |
| Budget Authority .....                                | 1,626,488    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Outlays .....   | 1,590,474    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Revenues .....  | 1,638,202    | 8,878,506        |
| Current Level:  |              |                  |
| Budget Authority .....                                | 977,899      | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Outlays .....   | 1,194,235    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Revenues .....  | 1,672,152    | 8,897,349        |
| Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level: |              |                  |
| Budget Authority .....                                | –648,589     | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Outlays .....   | –396,239     | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Revenues .....  | 33,950       | 18,843           |

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of \$648,589,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

#### OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of \$396,239,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

#### REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of \$33,950,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of \$18,843,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION  
COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2001

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

| House Committee                    | 2002   |         | 2002–2006 total |         |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                                    | BA     | Outlays | BA              | Outlays |
| Agriculture:                       |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 7,350  | 7,350   | 7,350           | 7,350   |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 2       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | –7,350 | –7,348  | –7,350          | –7,350  |
| Armed Services:                    |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 146    | 146     | 398             | 398     |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | –146   | –146    | –398            | –398    |
| Banking and Financial Services:    |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 8      | 9       | 46              | 47      |
| Difference .....                   | 8      | 9       | 46              | 47      |
| Education and the Workforce:       |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 5      | 5       | 32              | 32      |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | –5     | –5      | –32             | –32     |
| Commerce:                          |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 2,687  | 2,687   | –6,537          | –6,537  |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | –2,687 | –2,687  | –6,537          | 6,537   |
| International Relations:           |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Government Reform:                 |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | –1,995          | –1,995  |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 1,995           | 1,995   |
| House Administration:              |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Resources:                         |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | –3      | 365             | 88      |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | –3      | 0               | –3      |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | –365            | –91     |
| Judiciary:                         |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Small Business:                    |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Transportation and Infrastructure: |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Science:                           |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Veterans' Affairs:                 |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 264    | 264     | 3,205           | 3,205   |
| Current Level .....                | 0      | 0       | 0               | 0       |
| Difference .....                   | –264   | –264    | –3,205          | –3,205  |
| Ways and Means:                    |        |         |                 |         |
| Allocation .....                   | 1,360  | 900     | 15,409          | 15,069  |
| Current Level .....                | 6,425  | 6,425   | 36,708          | 36,708  |
| Difference .....                   | 5,065  | 5,525   | 21,299          | 21,639  |

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

| Appropriations Subcommittee          | 302(b) suballocations as of June 13, 2001 (H. Rept. 107–100) |         | Current level reflecting action completed as of July 11, 2001 |         | Current level minus suballocations |          |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------|---|---------|------------------------------------|----------|
|                                      | BA   | OT      | BA  | OT      | BA                                 | OT       |
| Agriculture, Rural Development ..... | 15,519   | 15,831  | 13  | 4,191   | –15,506                            | –11,640  |
| Commerce, Justice, State .....       | 38,541   | 39,000  | 41  | 12,755  | –38,500                            | –26,245  |
| National Defense .....               | 300,292  | 294,026 | 0   | 92,643  | –300,292                           | –201,383 |
| District of Columbia .....           | 382  | 401     | 0   | 48      | –382                               | –353     |
| Energy & Water Development .....     | 23,704   | 23,959  | 0   | 8,508   | –23,704                            | –15,451  |
| Foreign Operations .....             | 15,168   | 15,099  | 0   | 9,571   | –15,168                            | –5,528   |
| Interior .....                       | 18,941   | 17,768  | 36  | 6,104   | –18,905                            | –11,664  |
| Labor, HHS & Education .....         | 119,758  | 106,238 | 18,824  | 69,432  | –100,934                           | –36,806  |
| Legislative Branch .....             | 2,908  | 2,855   | 0   | 389     | –2,908                             | –2,466   |
| Military Construction .....          | 10,155   | 9,448   | 0   | 6,469   | –10,155                            | –2,979   |
| Transportation <sup>1</sup> .....    | 14,893   | 53,840  | 20  | 32,609  | –14,873                            | –21,231  |
| Treasury-Postal Service .....        | 16,880   | 16,134  | 340   | 3,658   | –16,540                            | –12,476  |
| VA-HUD-Independent Agencies .....    | 84,159   | 88,177  | 3,509   | 49,771  | –80,650                            | –38,406  |
| Unassigned .....                     | 0  | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0                                  | 0        |
| Grand Total .....                    | 661,300  | 682,776 | 22,783  | 296,148 | –638,517                           | –386,628 |

<sup>1</sup> Does not include mass transit BA.

*Statement of FY2003 advance appropriations under section 201 of H. Con. Res. 83, reflecting action completed as of July 11, 2001*

[In millions of dollars]

|  | Budget authority |
|--|------------------|
| Appropriate Level .....                | 23,159           |
| Current Level:                         |                  |
| Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee: |                  |
| Patent and Trademark Office .....      | 0                |

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

|  | Budget authority |
|--|------------------|
| Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Antitrust Division ..... | 0                |
| U.S. Trustee System .....                                    | 0                |
| Federal Trade Commission ....                                | 0                |
| Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills .....                       | 0                |

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

|   | Budget authority |
|---|------------------|
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee: |                  |
| Employment and Training Administration .....              | 0                |
| Health Resources .....                                    | 0                |
| Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program .....           | 0                |

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

|   | Budget authority |
|---|------------------|
| Child Care Development Block Grant .....                      | 0                |
| Elementary and Secondary Education (reading excellence) ..... | 0                |
| Education for the Disadvantaged .....                         | 0                |
| School Improvement .....                                      | 0                |

|  | Budget authority |
|--|------------------|
| Children and Family Services (head start) .....  | 0                |
| Special Education .....                          | 0                |
| Vocational and Adult Education .....             | 0                |
| Treasury, General Government Subcommittee: ..... |                  |
| Payment to Postal Service ....                   | 0                |

|   | Budget authority |
|---|------------------|
| Federal Building Fund .....                                 | 0                |
| Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee: ..... |                  |
| Section 8 Renewals .....                                    | 0                |
| Total .....   | 0                |
| Current Level over (+)/under (–) .....                      | –23,159          |
| Appropriate Level .....                                     |                  |

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SECTION 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

|                               |    | Statutory cap <sup>1</sup> | Current level    | Current level over (+) under (–) statutory cap |
|-------------------------------|----|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| General Purpose .....         | BA | 546,945                    | 22,783           | –524,162                                       |
|                               | OT | 537,091                    | 269,999          | –267,092                                       |
| Defense <sup>2</sup> .....    | BA | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | 0                | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
|                               | OT | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | 104,037          | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
| Nondefense <sup>2</sup> ..... | BA | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | 22,783           | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
|                               | OT | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | 165,962          | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
| Highway Category .....        | BA | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | ( <sup>3</sup> ) | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
|                               | OT | 28,489                     | 20,432           | –8,057   |
| Mass Transit Category .....   | BA | ( <sup>3</sup> )           | ( <sup>3</sup> ) | ( <sup>3</sup> )                               |
|                               | OT | 5,275                      | 5,093            | –182   |
| Conservation Category .....   | BA | 1,760                      | 0                | –1,760   |
|                               | OT | 1,232                      | 624              | –608   |

<sup>1</sup> Established by OMB Sequestration Preview Report for Fiscal Year 2002.<sup>2</sup> Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.<sup>3</sup> Not applicable.

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS RECOMMENDED BY H. CON. RES. 83 REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

|                               |    | Proposed statutory cap | Current level    | Current level over (+) under (–) proposed statutory cap |
|-------------------------------|----|------------------------|------------------|---|
| General Purpose .....         | BA | 659,540                | 22,783           | –636,757  |
|                               | OT | 647,780                | 269,999          | –377,781  |
| Defense <sup>1</sup> .....    | BA | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | 0                | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
|                               | OT | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | 104,037          | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
| Nondefense <sup>1</sup> ..... | BA | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | 22,783           | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
|                               | OT | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | 165,962          | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
| Highway Category .....        | BA | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | ( <sup>2</sup> ) | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
|                               | OT | 28,489                 | 20,432           | –8,057  |
| Mass Transit Category .....   | BA | ( <sup>2</sup> )       | ( <sup>2</sup> ) | ( <sup>2</sup> )  |
|                               | OT | 5,275                  | 5,093            | –182  |
| Conservation Category .....   | BA | 1,760                  | 0                | –1,760  |
|                               | OT | 1,232                  | 624              | –608  |

<sup>1</sup> Defense and nondefense categories would be advisory rather than statutory.<sup>2</sup> Not applicable.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2001.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2002 budget and is current through July 11, 2001. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H.

Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements. These revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. This is my first letter for fiscal year 2002.

Since the beginning of the first session of the 107th Congress, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for 2002: an act to provide reimbursement authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from wildland

fire management funds (P.L. 107–13), the Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–15), the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–16), an act to clarify the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the use of fees during fiscal year 2001 (P.L. 107–18), and an act to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative (P.L. 107–19). The effects of these new laws are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON

(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2002 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 11, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

|  | Budget authority | Outlays   | Revenues  |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Enacted in previous sessions:  |                  |           |           |
| Revenues .....   | 0                | 0         | 1,703,488 |
| Permanents and other spending legislation .....  | 984,540          | 934,501   | 0         |
| Appropriation legislation .....  | 0                | 280,919   | 0         |
| Offsetting receipts .....  | –321,790         | –321,790  | 0         |
| Total previously enacted .....   | 662,750          | 893,630   | 1,703,488 |
| Enacted this session:  |                  |           |           |
| An act to provide reimbursement authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from wildland fire management funds (P.L. 107–13) ..... | 0                | –3        | 0         |
| Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–15) .....  | 0                | 0         | –7        |
| Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–16) .....  | 6,425            | 6,425     | –31,337   |
| An act to clarify the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the use of fees (P.L. 107–18) .....               | 8                | 9         | 8         |
| An act to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative (P.L. 107–19) .....   | 0                | 2         | 0         |
| Total, enacted this session .....  | 6,433            | 6,433     | –31,336   |
| Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....   | 308,716          | 294,172   | 0         |
| Total Current Level .....  | 977,899          | 1,194,235 | 1,672,152 |

## FISCAL YEAR 2002 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 11, 2001—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

|   | Budget authority | Outlays   | Revenues  |
|---|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Total Budget Resolution .....               | 1,626,488        | 1,590,658 | 1,638,202 |
| Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....  | 0                | 0         | 33,950    |
| Current Level Under Budget Resolution ..... | -648,589         | -396,423  | 0         |
| <b>Memorandum:</b>                          |                  |           |           |
| Revenues, 2002-2006:                        |                  |           |           |
| House Current Level .....                   | 0                | 0         | 8,897,349 |
| House Budget Resolution .....               | 0                | 0         | 8,878,506 |
| Current Level Over Budget Resolution .....  | 0                | 0         | 18,843    |

Notes: P.L.—Public Law.  
Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements, disability reviews, an Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative, and adoption assistance. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the outlay allocation in the budget resolution by \$184 million for these purposes. These amounts are not included in the current level because the funding has not yet been enacted.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

### TOBACCO IS NUMBER ONE PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to be here this evening. Let me begin by talking a little bit this evening about tobacco issues, because I have been involved as a State attorney general on the issue of tobacco. I was involved in the massive piece of tobacco litigation that State attorneys general filed across the country in their respective States, and we also, as a result of that, had a settlement; and we learned a lot about tobacco, about tobacco companies, about tobacco companies targeting kids. It is something that is a pretty incredible story. It also says something about public health in America and where we should be headed.

That is our real purpose here tonight, is to talk about the public health side and to talk also about the side of the administration, this current administration, the Bush administration, carrying on a tobacco lawsuit, the Federal Government versus the tobacco companies; and we will also be talking about that.

First of all, let me talk a little bit about the public health problem when it comes to tobacco, because a lot of people do not understand the massive size of the public health problem that we have here in America when it comes to tobacco. Mr. Speaker, 435,000 people every year are killed by tobacco. These are tobacco-related deaths, and it is a huge number. When we hear the number, we all hear statistics and we wonder what they mean. Take all other causes of death out there, and let us just go through a few here, auto accidents, suicides, murders, deaths by infectious diseases, deaths from AIDS; think of any other chronic illnesses, heart disease. If we add a lot of these up and we total them, we still do not get to the number of deaths caused by tobacco.

So when we talk about the cause of death and talk about public health problems, we clearly have a huge one when it comes to tobacco; and it is one that I think is in a way demonstrated, and I am going to have another Member join me here and maybe others if

they want to come down and talk about this; but it is demonstrated by a physician that I talked to, a cancer doctor in New Mexico. She is an oncologist. She told me this story. She said, I work in the cancer field. It is a very trying field to work in. She is very interested in tobacco and lung cancer and that whole relationship.

□ 1915

She said, "If tomorrow we could stop people smoking, one-third of my patients would go away immediately." So the people that she is treating today, if we stopped individuals from smoking, she would lose an entire third of her patients. She of course said that she sees every day all the pain and suffering that people go through. She said, "I would be happy to have that happen, to see that loss of patients."

So when we are talking about cancer docs across the country taking a look at this, we can see the kind of impact it is having.

One of the other facts here that is very, very important is that tobacco companies have targeted our kids in America for addicting them to tobacco. I would just like to give some of the facts here.

People do not realize that the tobacco companies saw their markets going down about 10 or 15 years ago. They saw their markets going down. They saw the number of people shrinking. The older people were quitting. They did a lot of research. This is in their files. There were documents that we recovered from them as State attorneys general.

They discovered several things. They discovered first of all if they build their younger market, then they are able to increase their markets dramatically. That is what they did. They started targeting younger people to start smoking. It is documented. It is in there. It is something that is pretty astounding, when we think about it.

Listen to these figures. Almost 90 percent of the adult smokers began at or before the age of 18. So it is the young people that are starting, and they continue for their whole lives. Each day here in America more than 3,000 kids become regular smokers. That is more than 1 million kids a year. Roughly one-third of them will eventually die from tobacco-related disease.

Fifteen and one-half million kids are exposed to secondhand smoke at home.

More than 3 million of our children ages 12 to 17 are current smokers, and 900 million packs of cigarettes are consumed by our children a year. More than one-third of all these children who ever try smoking a cigarette become regular daily smokers before leaving high school.

That is what these tobacco companies knew all along. They knew if they got young people addicted, that they would stay addicted for a lifetime, and keep buying cigarettes, and their profits would keep going up. It is a horrible story to tell, but it is out there and it is documented. It is part of these tobacco lawsuits that the State attorneys general brought.

Now, who stepped in to do something about this? Very little was done at the Federal level in the 1990s. Did we see any other people stepping out to do something about it? Private individuals hired attorneys and went to court and tried to sue the tobacco companies.

The tobacco companies had never settled a case. They fought these cases all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, if they had to, and they always defeated these poor little plaintiffs, many of whom had smoked for 30, 40, or 50 years, and then had contracted lung cancer.

But in the 1990s, there were a group of attorneys general, first led by Attorney General Mike Moore from Mississippi, who filed the first lawsuit down there in Mississippi. It grew over the years, and eventually we had 45 attorneys general join this lawsuit.

These lawsuits were pushed hard. They were fought hard. There was an incredible battle going on in State courts with these lawsuits, but eventually there was a master settlement for \$240 billion. As part of that master settlement, the tobacco companies agreed to do a number of things: not target our kids, change their advertising, pay this \$240 billion over 25 years.

My little State of New Mexico, this was the largest civil settlement in the State of New Mexico for \$1.2 billion. Many of the States had something like that, settlements of that magnitude, so bringing in this kind of money was very important to the State.

I would say at this point that it is very, very important, and this is a side issue, but it is important that the States use this money on health-related issues, rather than using it to build roads or for a tax cut, or some of

the other things that they have used it for. These came out of health care monies. These were Medicaid monies that were spent by the States, it was the crux of the lawsuit, so these monies should go back into health care.

I am proud to say that my State of New Mexico has put this in a trust fund and is going to analyze this, and I think is going to head in the right direction.

But the point I wanted to make here in the State attorneys general filing these lawsuits is that we always wondered, when we would talk about bringing our lawsuits, and when we would visit on the telephone and in conferences about the cases, why the Federal Government was never bringing a lawsuit. The crux of our claims were basically Federal claims. They were Federal monies. They were State and Federal monies mixed in, and many of them were 50/50 matches. Why did the Federal Government never join us?

Eventually the Federal Government did, under President Clinton. They realized that we had made enormous progress. They realized that the settlement that had come about was in the interest of the public, so they filed a lawsuit. I think they also realized that \$240 billion was left on the table, something in that range that they could have gotten. So they joined in and they said, well, let us file a lawsuit, and they did file that lawsuit. That is what we are here to talk about today is where are we on that lawsuit, what is happening with it in this new administration.

Attorney General John Ashcroft, a very controversial nominee over there in the Senate, did a number of things on tobacco before he got into. One of the things he did was lead the fight in the Senate against the tobacco settlement, and he was very proud of the fact that he led the fight against Senator McCain, who at the Federal level tried to pass a bill and deal with the whole issue at the Federal level.

At one press conference, Attorney General Ashcroft was saying "It would be a big-government travesty at its biggest to use the tragedy of tobacco as a smokescreen to cover the expansion of the Nanny State." In other cases, Senator Ashcroft at the time said things like this was a frivolous lawsuit. He was the only one on the Senate Committee on Commerce that voted against reporting the tobacco settlement bill that was sponsored by Senator McCain.

So, basically, we have an individual that is in the Attorney General's office. He is the lead negotiator on this case. He is somebody that can make the decision one way or another as to how this case is handled, what the strategy is to pursue in court, and whether and on what terms it should be settled. That is really the issue that is before us this evening.

We have been joined this evening by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). I know that he has an interest

also in tobacco and these public health problems that are out there. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) to see if he is interested in talking a little bit about this current lawsuit and this current situation, and reflect on his views.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from the State of New Mexico, for yielding to me and providing me some time to talk about this very important issue tonight. I also wanted to applaud his efforts as attorney general of the State of New Mexico, and now as Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As I was listening to the gentleman, I was thinking about all of the viewers tonight who have children, and particularly daughters. I have an 11-year-old daughter, a soon to be 11-year-old daughter. She is a very important part of my life.

When I looked at the statistics that the gentleman has shared with us in general, and then broke them down into the statistics that apply to women and girls, I thought it was very striking. I want to share a few of those with the Members tonight, and then talk a little bit about the lawsuit situation, as well. It is stunning to think of some of these statistics and what they really mean.

Smoking prevalence is higher among women with 9 to 11 years of education than women with 13 to 15 years of education, and three times higher than women with 16 or more years of education. Smoking among girls and women has increased dramatically in the 1990s. From 1991 to 1999, smoking among high school girls increased from 27 percent to 34 percent.

A report published in the American Journal of Public Health shows that girls have an easier time buying cigarettes than boys, even at the youngest ages.

Now come the tragic statistics. In 1997, nearly 165,000 women died of smoking-related diseases. Since the Surgeon General's Report on Women and Smoking was released in 1980, about 3 million women in the U.S. have died prematurely. Three million women have died prematurely of smoking-related diseases.

As with men, smoking is related to heart disease and lung cancer, but women smokers also face increased risks of cervical cancer and osteoporosis. In the 1980s, lung cancer overtook breast cancer as the leading cause of cancer death in women. Since 1950, lung cancer mortality rates for women have increased 600 percent.

Cigarette smoking doubles the risk of coronary heart disease, and accounts for more than 80 percent of lung cancers in women. Women also have a more difficult time when they want to quit smoking. They have lower cessation rates, and girls and women aged 12 to 24 are much more likely to report being able to cut down on smoking than men and boys of those same ages.

Females are significantly more likely than boys to report feeling dependent on cigarettes, and are more likely to report feeling sad, blue, or depressed during attempts to quit smoking.

I would remind the viewers that cigarette companies first began targeting women in the 1920s. Up to that point, smoking among women was not particularly socially acceptable, but they were savvy. They equated smoking with freedom and emancipation.

Women continue to be a target of the cigarette companies. Cigarette advertising and promotions use themes of empowerment and sophistication. The cigarette companies, and I think my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, touched on this, but they spent more than \$8 billion in advertising and promotion in 1999, a 22 percent increase over the \$6.7 billion spent in 1998. This is the largest increase in dollar terms since the Federal Trade Commission began tracking industry sales in advertising in 1970.

Clearly, this points out that we have a real public health challenge, and that it is one that we cannot turn our backs on. The gentleman from New Mexico talked a little bit about the history of the lawsuits brought by the States that was then taken up by the Federal Government.

I, too, want to express my concern that Attorney General Ashcroft, given his past skepticism about the tobacco settlement bill, and indeed, his work to stop the tobacco settlement bill, is now heading up these efforts at the Federal level. I, too, want to lend my voice to the calls for the Attorney General to establish a neutral and independent review board to provide oversight of any proposed settlement.

I think such a review board could be composed of a bipartisan slate of attorneys general from the States who could act as neutral arbitrators. I would hope that the Attorney General would recuse himself, at a minimum, from the negotiation process.

This widespread use of tobacco is eating away at our society's physical and financial health. We cannot bear, I think, to wait another day before we continue these efforts to point out the dangers of this real epidemic to our public health.

□ 1930

I have been pleased to join my colleague, and at this point would yield back to him for further comments.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I very much want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for those comments. I know that he and I and many others here in the House of Representatives are going to be monitoring this very closely and trying to make sure that Attorney General Ashcroft does what is in the public interest if he stays on the case. I think we both feel he should not be on the case.

Let me also talk a little bit about the gentleman's comments about women. The women in America have

had a tragic situation when it comes to their relationship with tobacco. The statistics are pretty astounding. And that is why when we do these tobacco settlements, one of the conditions that should be in there and one of the ways settlement monies can be used is to try to do everything we can to educate people about quitting, offering them cessation courses, doing counter advertising.

One of the States that has done an incredible job is the State of California, which has put a tax on cigarettes and then taken that money and advertised and showed everybody that is out there the danger of tobacco, and they in particular target their advertising to young people and say this is going to be your future. They show them lungs that have been damaged. They show older individuals that have wrinkles all over their faces because of premature aging from smoking and try to let them know what kind of damage this is going to do. So it is important that we protect everybody, protect women, and that we come up with a variety of programs with these settlement monies to try to do that.

The gentleman's comments on Attorney General Ashcroft, I think, are crucial. And over and over again we see the statements he made as a United States Senator before he got to be Attorney General. Listen to his statement on FDA authority over the tobacco industry. This was from a letter dated June 7, 2000. "I believe that the most effective way to combat nicotine addiction by people of all ages is not to allow the FDA to regulate the tobacco industry."

Well, that is just the opposite of what we ought to be doing. President Clinton used FDA authority to get out there, to regulate, to say that you cannot target young people in this country, and the courts threw it out. So now we are in a situation where the FDA has no regulatory authority. I have authored a bill in the Congress that gives regulatory authority to the FDA. We have a number of sponsors on that, and I think that is a good solid piece of legislation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If the gentleman will continue to yield.

Did now Attorney General Ashcroft, but then Senator Ashcroft, propose a different system or did he just suggest we throw open the gates and everybody have at it? I cannot imagine where we would be if we had that kind of system up until this point, when after many years we have been able to gather information and data that suggested the addictive qualities and the detrimental qualities of nicotine and other substances.

It strikes me that this is a very illustrative comment, also one that causes me great concern.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. The gentleman's comment is correct, and when Senator Ashcroft made that statement he was specifically targeting FDA regulation. And really what he was say-

ing, he was taking a very libertarian approach; just let anybody do whatever they want and let the private sector work. Let the tobacco companies get out there and advertise all they want and get our young people addicted. And he is saying the government should play no role. That, I think, is an irresponsible position.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If the gentleman will further yield, the Attorney General is welcome to his own opinions. That is what makes this country so great, the first amendment and all the other traditions we have in our law and in our culture that encourages people to speak out on their point of view. But I would suggest that that particular set of sentiments is not held by the American people; that we have decided as a country that tobacco should be regulated, just like we regulate alcohol and other controlled substances.

That again points out the need to create an unbiased and bipartisan group who would oversee the Federal Government's activities in regards to this lawsuit. And this is not, incidentally, about Democrats or Republicans. There are people who have contracted these diseases and these problems in the 400,000 people the gentleman mentioned who are Republicans, Democrats, Libertarians, Green Party. I am sure there are even some anarchists in this group of people. This is not about partisan advantage, but this is about doing the right thing and representing or reflecting where the American people reside I think on this issue, which is that there is more to be done.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I cannot emphasize enough that the lawsuits that were brought by State attorneys general were brought by Democrats and Republicans. As the gentleman knows, in his home State of Colorado, Attorney General Gale Norton, who is now Secretary of the Interior, she brought a lawsuit in the State of Colorado against the tobacco companies. She was part of the master settlement. She, like everyone else, was very concerned about the situation with women, the targeting of young people and trying to addict them over a lifetime. So she was out there as a Republican, very active, and there were many other Republican attorneys general around the country that were involved. So this was a bipartisan effort.

Back to this issue of Attorney General Ashcroft being in charge of this lawsuit. I cannot, with all this evidence we have laid out there, I cannot think of a worse individual to be in charge of the Nation's lawsuit against the tobacco companies. It is really like putting the fox in charge of the hen house. This gentleman has condemned these lawsuits. He fought the tobacco settlement. He was the only one in the committee. The vote in the committee was 19 to 1. He was the one in the committee. And now we have him as Attorney General and he is the head litigator.

One of the first things he did was to announce, well, I think we have a weak lawsuit; we better settle. That is no way to go into a lawsuit. It is no way to go into settlement negotiations. You have to get in there and be tough with these companies, as the State attorneys general were. He seems to be folding his tent before he has even started.

So this raises the whole question of conflict of interest, it raises the question of an appearance problem, and it raises the whole issue of bias. And I think one of the individuals that said it the best was the person that wrote the editorial for The New York Times just a couple of weeks ago when they said "The Bush administration has shown a troubling propensity for putting the interests of industrial campaign backers before its duty to protect public health. The latest case in point is the Justice Department's curious announcement that it will attempt to settle the huge tobacco lawsuit against the tobacco industry brought by the Clinton administration 2 years ago, explaining in part that it thinks the case is weak. Attorney General John Ashcroft, a major opponent of the lawsuit when he was in the Senate, included no funding for the suit in his budget. So in that sense this week's action is no surprise. Mr. Bush's spokesman explains that the President thinks society is 'too litigious,' and that it is preferable to 'reach agreements,' but abandoning the case is not the way to preserve leverage."

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, that is so true. And in any contest you do not tell the other team before you take the field or take the court or arrive at the golf course that you have a weakened game that day and your team is not really prepared to compete. And that is what lawsuits are. They are often the last resort option that you have; but in many cases in our society, the judicial system has proven to be an important place to play out further the debate that is necessary in our society.

I was interested to also hear the comments about the Attorney General saying there was not enough money to pursue the case. Well, the number I have heard is about \$23 million. That is real money. But when we look at the cost of the lives and the cost that we have incurred societally in Medicare and Medicaid and all of our private health systems, that is a small amount of money to invest in doing right in all the areas the gentleman has suggested.

I also find it interesting that perhaps it was suggested that there was not any money available to pursue these lawsuits. But the Attorney General himself is in charge of putting together his budget. So it is a bit like saying I do not have any money, even though I am in charge of how the money is allocated. How you spend money gives a sense of your priorities. This clearly is not a priority for the Attorney General and potentially, by extension, the President.

I think it is a priority for the American people. That is why we are here tonight is to point out that there are thousands of American citizens who think this lawsuit ought to be pursued and that, in the end, this is not about lawsuits, it is not about money, it is not about even keeping score, it is about our children in particular and about the costs that tobacco use imposes on our society.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank my colleague very much for those comments. And let me follow on one of the thoughts that came out of what the gentleman just said and this New York Times editorial I just talked about.

There was a paragraph in there that I thought was particularly interesting that should be illuminated on a little bit. People may wonder why the Times said this. They said in the editorial, "the interests of industrial campaign backers before its duty to protect the public health." They were accusing the Bush administration of showing a troubling propensity to put the interests of industrial campaign backers before the duty of public health.

So what are they talking about there? And I have been following this very closely, because we all know when we run in campaigns and we are active and we are out there and doing fundraising the, fund-raising can tell us a lot about actions and agenda and those kinds of things. We have just finished here tonight a discussion of campaign finance reform, and so if we look at the Center for Responsive Politics and what they have researched on money in the last election, 83 percent, 83 percent of the tobacco contributions went to the Republican Party.

So when they talk about following contributors, I think that is what they are talking about there. If we look at individual contributions, \$90,000 went specifically to the Bush campaign, only \$8,000 to the Gore campaign. So we are talking about another large amount in terms of differences. A large disparity.

So the bottom line here is that President Bush has got to get a new negotiator. I wrote what I considered a very congenial letter. The gentleman mentioned it in his comments, a congenial letter to the President saying this is a problem, this is a conflict, this has an appearance, a serious appearance problem. This gentleman has come to the job with a bias and you have to get a new negotiator to protect the public interest.

Now, I do not have anybody in mind, and I would not be presumptuous to tell the President who to pick as his negotiator. He clearly needs someone he can trust, and he ought to replace the current Attorney General and just have him step aside on this. But the other way, it seems to me, with this whole cloud that is out there over this settlement, to take care of this, is to involve the State attorneys general.

There is nobody in the Nation with more credibility on this issue than the State attorneys general. They sued the

tobacco companies. They were the first ones to bring them to the table. They were the very first ones to get a settlement out of the tobacco companies. No other lawyers had ever done this before. The tobacco companies always used to wave their fingers at us and say, we fight to the end. If you file against us, we are going to fight it to the end and we have never paid a penny. Well, they paid \$240 billion. So that is a pretty penny there, I will tell you.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Again asking my colleague to yield, I would note that the President certainly is a proponent of Federalism. He certainly has taken the position in many cases that the States ought to have an important role in a lot of the decisions that are made in our country, and this suggestion that my colleague has brought up in his letter, I think, fits his philosophical approach, and bringing in the experts to work on behalf of all of the Americans and the attorney generals as my colleague suggests, Democrat, Republican, covering the whole political ideological spectrum, I think the gentleman mentioned 45 of them joined this case.

I would just urge the President to again look at the gentleman's letter. I am hopeful that we will have a response from him sooner rather than later.

□ 1945

If I might, since we were talking about the costs, I might touch on that one more time. It is easy to say these are other people's problems. It is easy to say we are all adults, and if one decides to smoke, they should bear some of the responsibility. There is some truth in both of those statements, but we are talking about doing all we can to make sure that children are not targeted. Children who begin smoking are much more likely to remain smokers throughout their lives.

Even if we feel there is some responsibility that adults have, and we do have those responsibilities, the costs that are incurred we all have to bear. We can acknowledge those costs or turn a blind eye to those costs.

The tobacco industry spent over \$8 billion in 1999 on advertising and promotional campaigns. That is \$22 million a day spent on these campaigns.

Now there is \$89 billion in total annual private and public health care expenditures caused by tobacco use; \$17 billion annual Federal and State Medicaid payments directly caused by tobacco use; \$20.5 billion Federal Government Medicare expenditures each year that are attributed to tobacco use; and \$8 billion other Federal Government tobacco-caused health care costs in particular through our Veterans Administration health care.

There is \$2.1 billion in addition annual expenditures through Social Security survivors insurance, the SSI program, for kids who have lost one or both parents through smoking-caused death.

Mr. Speaker, one that really catches my attention, \$1.4 billion to \$4 billion in additional annual expenditures for health and developmental problems of infants caused by mothers who smoke and for those infants who were exposed to secondhand smoke after they were born and, of course, during pregnancy.

These are very significant costs that we all bear as a society, and this is why I think it is very important that we continue to pursue the resolution of this situation. We ask the tobacco companies to carry their fair share.

I was curious to hear a little more, if it fits the rest of the gentleman's comments, about what the State of New Mexico has done about the monies from the settlement. You talked about California, but I am interested in how we can reduce the size of these statistics that I have just shared.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments. The State of New Mexico is planning to get about \$1.2 billion under the master settlement. That is the largest civil settlement in the State of New Mexico. The way that this settlement was worked out, it will flow in over 25 years. We do not have all \$1.2 billion at this time. We are getting smaller amounts, and they balloon up over time.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about some of the proposals that were out there and then what they are actually doing now, and maybe we can get into a discussion on that. First of all, the public health community came forward, many of these cancer doctors, the oncologists came forward, and the American Cancer Society and the American Lung Society, all of them came forward and said, we need to work on specifically how we spend these dollars.

They came up with what I thought were some very good recommendations. First of all, we could start a trust fund. One of the best recommendations, and I was very supportive of this and worked with my legislature, set up a trust fund and try to get the trust fund to the level that it was way up there in dollars so we could then use the principal rather than using the capital. If you took a lot of this money and put it into a trust fund, then there could be a perpetual flow of money to deal with the tobacco issues.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman is suggesting to treat it as an endowment for our children's future, and direct the return and the interest off the endowment into these efforts, and it would be a very conservative way to proceed, and that would ensure that those monies were there into perpetuity for use of citizens in the gentleman's home State?

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. And what we were trying to do in recommending some kind of trust fund was to say these issues are not going away. The tobacco companies are advertising, and they are still out there. We prevented them from targeting kids, but



they are still out there selling cigarettes. We know how many kids; 3,000 kids are starting smoking every day. The idea is get a trust fund, have those monies, the principal on your trust fund, work toward preventing that.

One of the most effective things that can be done is counteradvertising, and that is one of the recommendations that we were making. Go on television, go out with billboards, and any information you can give to the public about the dangers of smoking and try to target it to specific audiences and have it be relevant to those audiences.

After somebody gets addicted, they start when they are young, one of the next issues is how do you get them off. There are cessation programs. There are a variety of programs to help people wean themselves from cigarettes; and those could also be funded. Give people a chance to get themselves off of tobacco.

The thing that is deplorable to me is that many of the States have not taken this approach, have not headed down this road. New Mexico is not completely down this road either. They have taken the money and just let it flow into the general fund and spent on whatever comes up. Some States have taken the money and built roads.

This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. It is pretty rare that a State has a huge lump sum of money, anywhere from 5 to 6 to 1.2 or \$10 billion flowing into the State over 25 years. And if you are creative, inventive, you can really do, I think, some good things as far as public health and as far as our children.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Colorado we had that debate, and our Governor was very involved. If memory serves me right, we directed a significant amount of money into the very programs that have been created in New Mexico, and we have directed some into literacy programs and other programs which have been designated as worthy.

I have mixed feelings. I think a strong case could be made that all of the money ought to be used in the way the gentleman has suggested, where the principal is taken, and it generates a return, and all that can be done over a period of time is done to not only begin to reduce smoking, but eventually reach a point where none of our children start smoking at an age before they really understand the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, if an adult wants to utilize tobacco at some point, that is his or her right to do that. But as the gentleman points out, the statistics are staggering as to how many children start. They then carry that habit and addiction on into their adult years.

I was noting, too, the Attorney General mentioned that he had a concern that it would be a big government travesty to use the tragedy of tobacco as a smoke screen to cover the expansion of the nanny state.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would beg to differ with him, and I think many

Americans would, that this is an appropriate place for government regulation. This is an appropriate place for all of us through our government to come together and make sure that our children are not exposed to the great dangers of tobacco.

Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party, suggested that we do together through government what cannot be done solely as individuals.

It is clear that the power and the resources of the tobacco companies are enormous, and that the role that government can play in providing a counterbalance is crucial. Our free enterprise system provides for a lot of freedom, but it also asks corporations and large entities to act responsibly. I think that is the purpose at the heart of the litigation that has been brought, and I think that is again why I share the concerns that the Justice Department needs to look for a broader-based approach. It needs to involve other constituencies on a bipartisan basis in its pursuit of the important lawsuit that we have been discussing tonight.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there are two important points here. Number one, get a new negotiator. There are plenty of former Attorneys General, there are State attorneys general, there are people in the government. The President should have another negotiator in place.

Secondly, how do you give credibility to this whole process? The process right now has a big cloud over it. There are serious questions that have arisen. I think involving the States attorneys general, a group of attorneys general that can come in and say, we are headed towards a settlement now, is this a good settlement. Then they can visit privately with the administration. Also in the end they should be able to make public pronouncements about the validity of the lawsuit, the size of the settlement, what was extracted in the settlement. There is no group in this country that knows more about what should be in a settlement than State attorneys general.

I would hope that not only would he remove Attorney General Ashcroft from this, but he would also focus on some independent oversight by State attorneys general. I certainly believe that with the combination of those two items, that we would be able to have a good outcome here.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would appeal to all of our colleagues in the House, all 435 of us, to weigh in with the President, request that he consider what I thought was a very thoughtful request on the part of the gentleman from New Mexico, and I think other colleagues would join the gentleman if they knew the extent to which this is an important issue facing us.

Mr. Speaker, it is an opportunity. It is arguably a health care crisis, but it also presents us with a real oppor-

tunity. I hope colleagues who have been here and have listened to our special order tonight would consider also making their own pitch to the President that this is a worthy undertaking and one that will be remembered not just in the near future if we do it right, but will be remembered for decades to come; that we got ahold of this public health problem and that we did something about it when it was appropriate and when our kids are really what are at risk here.

So I want to commend the gentleman for providing the leadership in this important area, and for after 8 years as attorney general and now 3 years in this body is continuing the good work on behalf of our children.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership on this issue and caring about our children in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will say as we wrap up here that these are important issues to the American people.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 10 on account of illness.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 4:00 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's wedding in Hungary.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WICKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, July 18.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PLATTS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 16, 2001, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2859. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibited Purchasers in Foreclosure Sales of Multifamily Projects With HUD-Held Mortgages and Sales of Multifamily HUD-Owned Projects [Docket No. FR-4583-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AC69) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2860. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Investment Management/Office of Regulatory Policy, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Treatment of Repurchase Agreements and Refunded Securities as an Acquisition of the Underlying Securities [Release No. IC-25058; File No. S7-21-99] (RIN: 3235-AH56) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2861. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years (FY) 2001–2002 for two Rehabilitation Research Training Centers—received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2862. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years (FY) 2001–2003 for three Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects—received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2863. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Designation of Round III Urban Empowerment Zones and Renewal Communities [Docket No. FR-4663-I-01] (RIN: 2506-AC09) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2864. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; Rules and Regulations for Administration and Enforcement; Claims Procedure (RIN: 1210-AA61) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2865. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2866. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the semiannual reports of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2867. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen.

Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2868. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2869. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's FY 2000 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2870. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation—received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2871. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C and Subpart D—2001–2002 Subsistence Taking of Fish and Wildlife Regulations (RIN: 1018-AG55) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2872. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-third in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1998 through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2873. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Documentation of Immigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended—Diversity Visas—received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2874. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments; Organizational Changes; Miscellaneous Editorial Changes and Conforming Amendments [USCG-2001-9286] received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2875. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raising the Threshold of Property Damage for Reports of Accidents Involving Recreational Vessels [USCG 1999-6094] (RIN: 2115-AF87) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2876. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Maryland Swim for Life, Chester River, Chestertown, Maryland [CGD05-01-031] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2877. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Patapsco River, Baltimore, Maryland [CGD05-01-032] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2878. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Northeast River, North East, Maryland [CGD05-01-030] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2879. A letter from the Attorney, Research and Special Program Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials Regulations: Minor Editorial Corrections and Clarifications [Docket No. RSPA-2001-9567 (HM-189R)] (RIN: 2137-AD51) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2880. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A-1, 205B, 212, 412, 412EP, and 412CF Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-48-AD; Amendment 39-12281; AD 2001-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2881. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 99-SW-06-AD; Amendment 39-12282; AD 2001-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2882. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-12294; AD 2001-12-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2883. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-200, 747-300, 747SP, and 747SR Series Airplanes Powered By Pratt & Whitney JT9D-3 and JT9D-7 Series Engines [Docket No. 2000-NM-354-AD; Amendment 39-12279; AD 2001-12-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2884. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corporation 7, 8, and 11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-CE-121-AD; Amendment 39-12255; AD 2000-25-02 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2885. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-12253; AD 2001-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2886. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-12293; AD 2001-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2887. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes, and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-322-AD; Amendment 39-12278; AD 2001-12-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2888. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model BAe.125 Series 800A (C-29A and U-125 Military), 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; Hawker 800 (U-125A Military) Airplanes; and Hawker 800XP and 1000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-212-AD; Amendment 39-12285; AD 2001-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2889. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Aerospace Corporation Model K-1200 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-50-AD; Amendment 39-12283; AD 2001-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2890. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 155B Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-08-AD; Amendment 39-12284; AD 2001-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2891. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Payment or Reimbursement for Emergency Treatment Furnished at Non-VA Facilities (RIN: 2900-AK08) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2892. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Board of Veterans' Appeals: Rules of Practice—Effect of Procedural Defects in Motions for Revision of Decisions on the Grounds of Clear and Unmistakable Error (RIN: 2900-AK74) received July 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2893. A letter from the Secretaries, Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture, transmitting notification of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and Forest Service lands at the Fort Leonard Wood Military Reservation in the State of Missouri, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 2069. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance to prevent, treat, and monitor HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan African and other developing countries; with an amendment

(Rept. 107-137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7. A bill to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government program delivery to individuals and families in need, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets; with amendments (Rept. 107-138 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1140 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 2480. A bill to reauthorize, improve, and expand conservation programs administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2481. A bill to improve maritime safety and the quality of life for Coast Guard personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 2482. A bill to repeal the tuition-sensitivity trigger in the Pell Grant program and to expand qualifying expenses and income eligibility for the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of items and services provided to Medicare beneficiaries residing in rural areas; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve outpatient vision services under part B of the Medicare Program; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON

of Connecticut, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow advanced applied technology equipment to be expensed and to reduce the depreciation recovery periods for certain other property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2486. A bill to authorize the National Weather Service to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to tropical cyclone inland forecasting improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a scholarship program to encourage and support students who have contributed substantial public services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 2488. A bill to designate certain lands in the Pilot Range in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. HART (for herself, Ms.

MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. HORN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 2489. A bill to provide effective training and education programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, and individuals entering nontraditional employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the hospital ownership exception to physician self-referral restrictions to interests purchased on terms generally available to the public; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 2491. A bill to establish a grant program to train law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mr. BUYER,

Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KERNS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KELLER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 2492. A bill to authorize the President to posthumously advance the late Admiral Raymond Ames Spruance to the grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2493. A bill to repeal the requirements under the United States Housing Act of 1937

for residents of public housing to engage in community service and to complete economic self-sufficiency programs; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. REYES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2494. A bill to provide an additional 2.3 percent increase in the rates of military basic pay for members of the uniformed services above the pay increase proposed by the Department of Defense so as to ensure at least a minimum pay increase of 7.3 percent for each member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2495. A bill to provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Bay Mills Indian Community and the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 2496. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to develop and implement a strategy for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of distributed power hybrid energy systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2497. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish certain requirements for managed care plans; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to protect consumers from inadequate disclosures and certain abusive practices in rent-to-own transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 2499. A bill to terminate funding for the Fast Flux Test Facility at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; referred to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACA:

H. Res. 190. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that schools should educate children about and organize community service projects related to the role of Native Americans in American history and culture, and that there should be a paid holiday in honor of Native Americans for all Federal, State, and local government employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WELLER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GRUCCI):

H. Res. 191. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately

transfer to the Israeli Government an unedited and uncensored videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000, when Hezbollah forces abducted 3 Israeli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. NUSSLE.  
H.R. 17: Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 94: Mr. REYES.  
H.R. 116: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
H.R. 123: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. STENHOLM.  
H.R. 162: Mr. BACHUS.  
H.R. 239: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 265: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 382: Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 415: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 435: Mr. NUSSLE.  
H.R. 570: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
H.R. 599: Mr. BONILLA.  
H.R. 606: Mr. OLVER.  
H.R. 658: Mr. REYNOLDS.  
H.R. 664: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WU, and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.  
H.R. 684: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 774: Mr. EHLERS.  
H.R. 777: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
H.R. 804: Mr. LAHOOD.  
H.R. 817: Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 822: Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. HYDE.  
H.R. 831: Mr. KERNS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WAMP, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
H.R. 839: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
H.R. 844: Mr. GREENWOOD.  
H.R. 912: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. STEARNS.  
H.R. 951: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 967: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. WALSH.  
H.R. 972: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 984: Mr. FOSSELLA.  
H.R. 986: Mr. MCHUGH.  
H.R. 1012: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 1016: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 1071: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. STUPAK.  
H.R. 1112: Mr. LANTOS.  
H.R. 1121: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. BARR of Georgia.  
H.R. 1143: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. BORSKI.  
H.R. 1169: Mr. MASCARA.  
H.R. 1187: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
H.R. 1192: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 1198: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ISSA.  
H.R. 1238: Mr. WELLER and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1268: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1307: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1353: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1354: Mr. MCHUGH and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN.

H.R. 1360: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1434: Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1452: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 1536: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1556: Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BACA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1582: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1591: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1596: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1598: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1600: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1604: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1611: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1624: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1644: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1645: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 1650: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1657: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1677: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1680: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 1705: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1735: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1762: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1797: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1811: Mr. OSE.

H.R. 1832: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1864: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1877: Mr. OWENS and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1897: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FORD, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1899: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1919: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1935: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 1954: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1975: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1982: Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 1984: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1990: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1992: Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 1997: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2037: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 2064: Mr. FILNER and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 2069: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KING, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. LEE,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2102: Mr. TURNER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2117: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2123: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 2126: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2145: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2153: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2163: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2208: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2219: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2244: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2281: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 2315: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 2329: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 2335: Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2340: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2380: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. STARK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2412: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2420: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2435: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2453: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2457: Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2478: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. DEFazio.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. LATHAM.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Con. Res. 103: Mr. REYES.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. COOKSEY.

H. Con. Res. 162: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SOLIS.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BASS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Res. 17: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 117: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 137: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 186: Mr. SMITH of Texas.